C.L. Copy

FEBRUARY 1963

MONTHLY REVIEW

AN INDEPENDENT SOCIALIST MAGAZINE

VOL. 14

10

WHERE THE WORLD STANDS

REVIEW OF THE MONTH

REVOLUTION ON THE FARM

MICHAEL MUNK

AMERICAN RADICALISM: LIBERAL OR SOCIALIST?

RONALD RADOSH

C. Wright Mills and the American Left

EUGENE V. SCHNEIDER

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CONTENTS | VOLUME FOURTEEN NUMBER TEN FEBRUARY 1963

REVIEW OF THE MONTH: Where The World Stands 529
REVOLUTION ON THE FARM by Michael Munk 538
CUBA'S MISSION: Letter from Cuba 549
C. WRIGHT MILLS AND THE AMERICAN LEFT:
by Eugene V. Schneider 553
AMERICAN RADICALISM: LIBERAL OR SOCIALIST?
by Ronald Radosh 564
THE DEMOLITION MEN: THE U.S. AND THE CRISIS OF
NEUTRALITY IN SOUTHEAST ASIA by Keith M. Buchanan 575
WORLD EVENTS by Scott Nearing 584

MONTHLY REVIEW: Published monthly except July and August when bimonthly, and copyright, ©1963, by Monthly Review, Inc. Second class postage paid at New York, N. Y.
EDITORIAL AND BUSINESS: 333 Sixth Avenue, New York 14, New York.
Telephone: CHelsea 2-6494.
NEWSSTAND DISTRIBUTOR: B. De Boer, 188 High Street, Nutley, N. J.
SUBSCRIPTION PRICE: *One year—$6 in the U.S.; $7 foreign.*
By 1st class mail—U.S. $8; everyhere else $9.
By air mail—No. America $10; So. America $15; Europe $20; Asia and Africa $25.
EDITORS: Leo Huberman and Paul M. Sweezy.

NOTES FROM THE EDITORS

When MR was founded as an independent socialist magazine in 1949, the editors invited Dr. Albert Einstein, the great scientist and humanist, to formulate for publication his ideas on the subject of socialism and the resulting article (to which he gave the title "Why Socialism?") appeared in the magazine's first issue, dated May 1949. Available copies of this issue were soon exhausted, while requests for Dr. Einstein's article steadily increased. In February 1951, it was published as a separate pamphlet, and it has twice been republished since. When the stock was again exhausted recently, we decided to give this little socialist classic a new and more appropriate format. It is now available once again. Price 20¢ for single copies, $1 for 6 copies, and $5 for 35 copies.

In addition to *Why Socialism?* we are also reprinting another socialist classic, Engel's *Principles of Communism,* translated by Paul Sweezy. Price 25¢ a copy, $1 for 5 copies, and $5 for 30 copies.

We are also proud to announce two new pamphlets: (1) *Economic Development, Planning, and International Cooperation,* by Oskar Lange, one of Poland's leading economists and planners; and (2) *British Guiana,* by Ved Prakash Vatuk. The latter is a charming and sympathetic report by an Indian now teaching at an American college, who went to British Guiana to study that country's folk music. The price of each of these new pamphlets is 50¢.

(*continued on inside back cover*)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WHERE THE WORLD STANDS

We are putting this issue of *MR* to bed early in January preparatory to departing on a long-planned but long-delayed trip to South America. There are many people to be seen in the leading South American countries—editors, publishers, writers. We hope to be able to work out with them plans and arrangements that will result in an improved two-way flow of ideas and information between progressive forces in the United States and in Latin America. Being preoccupied with preparations for the trip, as well as with urgent MR Press matters that could not be postponed, we decided to devote this space in the February issue to a guest Review of the Month. The author is a man with long and rich experience as a writer and editor, whose present job requires him to travel extensively. In this piece, he articulates what many must feel about the historic crisis through which we are living.—The Editors

The Cuban crisis, which clearly revealed the bankruptcy of the nuclear approach to world power and for the first time showed to many the awful face of looming destruction, also gave the world a chance, perhaps a final chance, to see where it stands. Where does the world stand, and what is at stake for man?

Let us, if we can, stand aside for a moment from the passions of the day and survey as impartially as possible the truly terrifying situation in which the human race finds itself at the present time. Nothing in man's past prepares him to cope with the magnitude of the problem that now confronts him—the possibility, nay the probability, of the physical destruction of the world in which he lives. Leaders of great states and the political systems they represent carry on just as they have in past times, despite the fact that their policies can only mean the extermination of their peoples and the destruction of their countries. No alternative policies have been proposed or studied—a military decision over the enemy through superior force is the only course followed, even though the leaders of both East and West admit that there can be no victor in a future war, only defeat and ruin for both sides. But their actions belie these words—the continuing nuclear tests, with no end in sight, the race for control of the weather, the space race with

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

all its military implications, the boosting of arms budgets, and many other moves along the same lines clearly show that the aim is still to subdue the enemy through force of arms. This contest can have only one end—war. And war—despite all that is said to the contrary by the military apologists—will mean the end of the world as we know it, perhaps the end of human life.

We should, while we can, consider what is meant by human life. It is no chance thing, no accident, though some thinking of the day might call it that. Human life as we find it today is the result of not less than five billion years of tireless, painstaking creation on the part of powers that preceded man, that live in him, and that will certainly outlast him, regardless of what happens to him in the present crisis. Let me hasten to say that I am not trying to make a point here in a sectarian or religious sense; there is too much of that, too much use and misuse of hackneyed phrases that have lost their meaning and have little relevance to man's grave plight today. Words, past attitudes, will not suffice. Man's plight is dire; the soul-shattering problems presented to him are the gravest in all human history. Every man must fight for the survival of his own soul. This is the point made here. Let me see if I can explain it further.

What faces man is a universal problem, and must find a universal solution. It encompasses all sects, all creeds, all religions, all philosophies, all human viewpoints, because the problem is that of human survival. It is a problem for each individual. Man's rulers can no longer save him. He must save himself, if he is to be saved. Heretofore, deity itself, to use a term applicable to the present discussion as explained above, has had control of man and his destinies. Man has not had the power of self-destruction. This is no longer the case. Man himself is to be the judge, and this is the essential meaning of today's crisis. Man must act, one way or the other—the problem has been posed for him in inescapable fashion. He can no longer count on deity to save him from disaster—he must save himself, if there is to be any salvation for him. It does no good to ask why this is so—we can only face up to the fact that it is so, that every living man is now called upon to take action if the impending burning of the world is to be averted.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Poisoned World

Let us not deceive ourselves—the atmosphere of this world on which all life depends has been poisoned for all time to come. To what degree we know not, and perhaps only some millions of deformed monsters or other millions doomed to horrible deaths through cancer will be the whole price we pay for nuclear pollution so far; but we really do not know, the scientists are in disagreement, and it is entirely possible that we have already ruined the earth's atmosphere for all future generations of men. One thing is clear, however—we have already passed the point of no return, each nuclear test is an irrevocable act destroying what can never be replaced, and the tests go on, with no end in sight, each an increase in scope and intensity over what has gone before.

But nuclear testing is only part of the picture. Let us sample some of the day's news in its more diabolical aspects:

Washington, July 14 (UPI): Forty Army scientists are working on a project that could add deadly super germs of types that do not exist in nature to the potential of biological warfare. . . . They already have succeeded in producing bacteria with new combinations of hereditary characteristics.

It takes no imagination to visualize the spread of these dread bacteria to humankind. Pennies are raised on street corners for research in polio, cancer, tuberculosis, and other dread scourges, while millions are spent on creating unknown new plagues to be loosed on the world. No words apply here—surely this is stark raving insanity on a scale never found before in human history.

London, August 3 (AP): George A. Bacon, research officer at Britain's principal germ warfare establishment, died of pneumonic plague—the dread Black Death which ravaged Europe in the Middle Ages.

Honolulu (AP): Rep. Daniel K. Inouye [D-Hawaii] reports American scientists are perfecting "a horrible weapon" capable of destroying all the earth's vegetation. . . . He said scientists are seeking to perfect it so that it may be used in small areas with limited and controlled effect. . . . In Washington, the Defense Department declined comment.

Washington, September 1 (AP): The man-made radiation belt created by the U. S. high-altitude hydrogen bomb explosion

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

on July 9 is much stronger than was anticipated and may persist for many years. . . . The nuclear blast left behind a substantial and greater-than-anticipated increase in the intensity of the more natural Van Allen radiation belt . . . this result is not fully understood.

Similar tests, which are condemned by many leading scientists, are being planned.

Washington, September 15 (UPI): The United States and Russia are in a scientific race to achieve human control of the world's weather and thus possess the "ultimate weapon.". . . Dr. Alan T. Waterman, director of the National Science Foundation, told the Congressmen that the weather studies were dealing with forces "almost beyond imagination." He said great caution had to be exercised because some careless scientific tinkering might touch off a catastrophic reaction. . . . During the discussion, Waterman also warned that the world's rocket program may cause worldwide changes in the upper atmosphere. He said such inadvertent modifications of molecules in the upper regions by large rockets should be studied with great care.

These items represent a mere sixty-day sampling of the news. Can anyone doubt that all of this, along with the race for the moon and the control of outer space, designed to secure a military decision over the opponent in a world in which military decisions are no longer possible, will end in unspeakable disaster at an early date?

What Is At Stake

The figures that follow here are close enough for the purpose at hand. They are constantly being modified through scientific progress and research, but are based on study of the appropriate literature and the meaning is clear. Our planetary system came into being about five billion years ago. The world is about half that old—two and a half billion years. Primitive apes roamed the earth as long as 25 million years ago. Man's whole history is just a brief glimmer of light at the end of that long gestation whose end result he was: South African man, the first tool-making being—preceded by no one knows how many species of sub-men such as the one who lived in Kenya 14 million years ago—has an age of approximately 1,750,000 years. Java man is 300,000 years old; Peking man, 250,000 years.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Neanderthal man, living between 75,000 and 45,000 years ago, had religious altars and buried his dead. The noted anthropologist Loren C. Eiseley has suggested that this message could come to us across the centuries from Neanderthal man: "We too were human, we too suffered, we too believed that the grave was not the end. We too, whose faces affright you now, knew human agony and human love." Cro-Magnon man, our direct ancestor, lived 30,000 years ago.

The human mind cannot think in terms of five billion years, or a million years, or even a thousand years, but it can observe and understand the workings of time, and it does not require genius to look upon our solar system and its evolution to date to find evidence of a painstaking creative task, proceeding in orderly fashion from the beginning of time. These are questions which scientists and philosophers argue about, but the evidence of orderly evolution is there, and man, the result of that evolution, is there. Though a mere infant, just born in fact as time goes, he has begun to make progress, he has already brought forth some magnificent human types, and if all the evidence coming to us from the past means anything, he can continue to make progress just as he has from the beginning.

We will not speak of the other planetary systems throughout the cosmos where the possibility of intelligent life exists. There are said to be as many as a million of them in the Milky Way alone. But we do not really know. Even with the use of nuclear energy, according to present knowledge, it would take hundreds of years of space travel for a human being to reach a planet where life such as his might exist—certainly a remote possibility under the best circumstances. So we must admit that knowledge of life as we know it, outside of possible electromagnetic communication, will be confined to our own solar system. We are confined to our system just as the individual is held rigidly within the bounds of his own being.

As to life within this system, the earth seems to be the only place where it is present. The clouds of Venus may shelter some form of life, there may be some rudimentary organisms such as lichens and algae on Mars, but as far as human life goes, we ourselves are perhaps all there is of it and all there will ever be of it for this corner of eternity at least. When we go, life

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

goes forever—five billion years of patient creative endeavor brought to a sudden halt.

It should not go without comment that the earth's unique atmosphere, which is responsible for the unique phenomenon of human life, is the very thing that is under attack from the nuclear devices which seem to spell man's doom. It should also be noted that food and water, the other essential elements of life, are also chief targets of these diabolical engines of earth.

Generation Without Vision

Ours is a generation without imagination and vision, so filled with complacency that we can go about our work while the plans to burn whole countries and continents go forward. Do the labor and love of the billions of human beings who preceded us mean nothing? All the statisticians of the world, armed with the most elaborate computing devices designed to reduce data in billionfold form to understandable terms, could not make even a bare beginning toward evaluation of the infinite toil and hardship that has gone into the creation of the world as we know it. Let me give one infinitely small illustration of what is meant. A typical human figure is that of a woman by a campfire, in cave or tent or on the open plain. To bring up her child, she cooked as many as 20,000 meals if food was available. In her life, she cooked as many as 50,000 meals. The women of pioneer America, and the mothers of some of us still living, did that. With their cooking they kept the house and sewed the clothes, worked long hours and tended the sick and buried the dead. The fathers knew hardship, toil, suffering, and death, and this has been the lot of man throughout the ages. Let one think of the 1,500 generations of man since Cro-Magnon times alone. One can say that this was a life of harsh necessity, as it was; but it was also a life of service and love. Men and women strove that their children might have a better chance in life than they; men suffered and died for the sake of others to come after them. The eternal symbol of human life is that of the old woman with withered face and hands, worn out in the service of others, neglected, unappreciated, but imparting the very stuff of life to future generations. All of past life is a vast tissue made up of the figures of men and women

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

who toiled with little or no recompense that the future might live. The point made here is that blowing up the world will render meaningless all the toil, sacrifice, and countless individual tragedies of the past. Can this not be understood, if only in terms of one's immediate ancestors?

Man is not the only being at stake in today's world crisis. This evolution of five billion years which the human mind cannot even begin to grasp, so vast, so complex, so intricate, so infinitely trillion-faceted is every aspect of it, has produced, in the same painstaking fashion as the human being was produced, all species of flowers and plants, the violet and the rose, the endless variety of edible plants giving food to man, the sheltering trees, the healing medicinal herbs; all animals, insects, birds, the mockingbird, the nightingale, the lion, the lamb, the soft-eyed doe, the suppliers of meat and milk; the fishes of the sea, the whale, the sturgeon, the trout, the sustenance of the humble, the feeders of the multitude; all these forms of life, in their millionfold manifestations, including the crowning achievement man, all the result of close painstaking evolution, moving in orderly fashion for billions of years, are menaced by the grave nuclear crisis. Each living being represents the final link in five billion years of patient orderly evolution, but there will be no further links after the bombs fall.

It is often said that nuclear war would not necessarily destroy all forms of life, not even all human life. But the world's stockpile of nuclear arms now holds a heavy tonnage for each man, woman, and child on an individual basis, and this tonnage is growing at an astronomical rate. It is folly to think that nuclear arms would be limited in their use once conflict comes—the bombs would fall as long as there were arms to fire them, they would continue to rain upon the world until the last one had been used, and what would be left would offer no abode for any kind of meaningful life. The atmosphere would be polluted a millionfold beyond the already dangerous level—who can think of any possibility of the continuance of life under such circumstances? This is a very important point, because the growing military thought on both sides now is that it might be just possible to wage and win a nuclear war.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Nuclear war means universal death—let no one be deceived on that point.

Capitalism and Socialism

Capitalism and socialism are only two of the forms of human society achieved by man in his long climb up from the animal world. Both are imperfect forms of human society, both are undergoing great change at the present time, and both will certainly experience great modification if the world endures. State power is growing in the West; individual freedom is growing in the East. Wise men say that the two systems will grow to resemble each other in a period of short decades. Other systems will emerge, superior to both capitalism and socialism. As man evolves into a higher being, which is his destiny, he will develop new orders of society befitting his higher status. Capitalism and socialism will pass into history along with feudalism, the divine right of kings, and other systems of the past now on their way to oblivion.

No reasonable man can deny the truth of what has been said here. Is it then possible to justify the incineration of the world just because one does not approve of an opposing social system, or feels menaced in the possession of one's property, or feels that the presence of a foe who offers a transient menace to one's way of life is intolerable under any circumstances? Only one answer is possible to questions such as these—the horror of nuclear war would exceed to the billionth degree any possible advantage to be expected from it. Certainly there is not enough basic difference between the two opposing systems to warrant a nuclear struggle which will destroy both, along with the lands and inhabitants of the contending powers.

The Job To Be Done

Every living man who wants the world to endure, who wants his children to live, must act now, must raise his voice against the prevailing insanity while there is yet time. This is a job for the churches as well as for laymen everywhere, because when the world goes, man goes, the church goes, and God goes from the hearts of this universe of men for all time to come. That is the real meaning of hell and eternal death in our time.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Man has only started to live. He has lived less than 2 million years—hardly a breath as time is measured, because he has perhaps 10 billion years yet to go, if he is only allowed to survive. He is on the verge of great things, great breakthroughs into fields of knowledge that will enable him to establish a true Kingdom of God right here on earth. All he needs is time, and he has plenty of that if the burning of the world can be averted.

And who is to say that he cannot find answers to the great ultimate questions that have always troubled him? The advances made by man in less than 2 million years certainly argue for much greater progress—inconceivable progress—in the billions of years left him if the world is allowed to survive. Man has sought divinity throughout time—this is his nature. Who knows what undreamed of heights he may reach if he is only allowed to live?

(January 5, 1963)

Our century is not only one of over-production and the perfecting of technical means and of great scientific discoveries, it is also a century of endemic famines, of leprosy, of record rates of infant mortality, and of ignorance.

It is not only a world of space vehicles, it is also the world of those who urgently need wheelbarrows, hoes and trucks.

It is not only the world of interplanetary voyages, it is also the world of villages imprisoned in jungles and deserts.

It is not only the world of the atom and of great human hopes, it is also that of homes without fire or bread.

It is a century of incredible wealth for some and of misery for others. It is a century when the science of man and universal resources are being used for ends which are much more destructive than constructive.

In fact, the manufacture of war material and the upkeep of huge armies requires material, technical, financial and human resources which are an insult to those in the world who are starved, an insult to humanity which deeply aspires to peace, security and progress in fraternity and solidarity.

—Sekou Touré, President of the Republic of Guinea, to the U.N. General Assembly

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

REVOLUTION ON THE FARM

BY MICHAEL MUNK

The horse-drawn plough and other traditional implements of farming are already quaint exhibits in the museum of history. So, too, will be the way of life associated with those tools. For the family farm is disappearing under the pressure of modern agricultural methods. As Walter Lippmann has said, "The industrial farms with their machinery and technology are swallowing the traditional farms. We are in the midst of an agricultural revolution which is epochal in its consequences."

Figures are the most telling proof of this. In October, 1955, Special Correspondent reported in *MR*: "The time is not far off when less than 10 percent of the population will dwell on farms." Only four years later, 7.9 percent of the population was counted by the Census of Agriculture as living on farms and today the percentage is lower still.

Not only has the number of people living on farms declined but so also have the number of farms themselves. The 1955 Agricultural Census showed about 4.8 million farms in operation, a decline of 11 percent over the previous five years. But the 1959 Census now lists only 3.7 million farms, the relative drop (23 percent) being more than twice that of the previous five-year period. Estimates for 1962 show an accelerated decline to about 3.4 million, while it is fully expected that another 2 million farms will be swept up before the agricultural revolution is over.

The Department of Agriculture recently predicted that within 13 years, agriculture will be on a relatively stable plateau on which 1.3 million farms will produce $41 billion of food and fiber necessary to sustain the projected population of 200 million people. These remaining farms would bear a striking resemblance to socialist collective or state farms: large, mechanized enterprises, employing up to thousands of semi-skilled or

---

The author, currently on the staff of the *National Guardian,* was formerly a research worker with a farm labor education organization.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

skilled workers. But, unlike their socialist counterparts, they will be earning billions of dollars for their owners, who will frequently be industrial corporations. (Already, some investment houses are counseling clients to invest in corporate farming.)

With this prospect in mind, the Committee for Economic Development has proposed the removal of two million of the nation's 5.5 million farmers and farm workers off the land and into the industrial labor force within the next five years. Every society, whether beginning or completing its industrial revolution, must face the challenges implicit in the movement of millions of people from rural farms to industrial cities. In the remainder of this article, I shall try to uncover the roots of these challenges in the structure of agriculture, and show how such problems as migratory labor and subsequent changing social patterns in our industrial cities are caused by the revolution in this structure. It should also be made clear that capitalist society is not equipped to deal with these problems as a matter of public policy. It can only mitigate the effects but cannot control the causes without a basic reorganization.

The Structure of American Agriculture

Less than 30 years separate John Steinbeck's famous novel *The Grapes of Wrath* from the searing documentary film "Harvest of Shame," which depicts the plight of the migratory farm worker today. During these years, the agricultural revolution could have been dealt with at its roots and we would not now have to watch the angering spectacle of members of our celebrated "affluent society" living and working like slaves. But it is not only the half-million migratory workers who are involved. It is in the lives of 2 million hired farm workers and another 2 million small farmers that the system receives its most graphic condemnation.

Table 1 shows the trend towards polarization between a small group of corporate and other large farms ("agri-business" is the term used in California), and about 2 million family farms whose net cash income from farming averages about $600 a year.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Table 1

Annual Sales (dollars)	*Number of Farms* 1954	1959
0-2,500	2,681,000	1,638,000
2,501-9,999	1,519,000	1,272,000
10,000 & over	583,000	794,143
Total:	4,783,000	3,704,143

In 1959, the farms with sales over $10,000 a year, less than one-fifth of all farms, accounted for 72 percent of the total farm sales of $35 billion.

A revealing new breakdown in the 1959 Census established new categories for "part-time" farms and "part-retirement" farms. In the former, the operator worked more than 100 days off the farm or had income greater from non-farm than from farm sources; and in the latter, the operator was over 65 years of age. Thus the U. S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) was able to state that of the 1.6 million farms with less than $2,500 in sales, 1.3 million were not "commercial farms"! These farms are not included in Table 2 below, which shows the distribution of net income and sales.

Table 2

1959 Sales (dollars)	*No. of Commercial Farms* (millions)	*Average Net Income (including off-Farm)* (dollars)	*Percent of Total Sales*
0-2,500	0.3	963	1.5
2,501-9,999	1.3	3,548	22.8
10,000 & over	0.8	8,614	71.9

At the other end of the scale, the latest Census makes another new departure which indicates the growing importance of agri-business. It shows that in 1959, some 1,200 giant farms had sales of over $500,000, in which are included such "family farms" as that of the DiGiorgios of California. This "farm" is operated by a single family, but it employs about 3,000 workers, controls 25,000 acres, and had sales of $111 million in 1961.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Another 100,943 farms had sales between $40,000 and $500,000. Although the government does not see fit to reveal what percentage of total farm sales are represented by these giant farms, this group effectively maintains the well-oiled propaganda machinery that continually opposes any social welfare measures for farm workers or small farmers.

Nowhere is the sharp division between the sectors of the agricultural economy more revealing than in state and national average farm income figures. While the national average is only $2,548 (in 1960), the range is from $11,391 in Arizona to less than $800 in West Virginia.

During the past several years, the USDA has slowly come to acknowledge publicly that its farm programs, such as the Farmers' Home Administration which makes loans to family size farms, cannot really help the farmer who needs them most. After years of propaganda to the contrary, the Department has now arrived at a distinction between "efficient" and "inefficient" family farms. The "efficient" farmers can be helped through loans and price support programs; the "inefficient" ones had better pack up and sell out. How does the Department define this crucial term? By gross annual sales! All those with sales of more than $10,000 are *ipso facto* "efficient," those with less are "inefficient." This is based on the assumption that $10,000 in gross sales will produce about $2,500 net income annually, but a more recent study by the Department showed that $13,400 in gross sales were necessary to produce this minimal income level. By the USDA's own definition, another 300,000 farms have become "inefficient."

The structure of agriculture envisaged for 1975 is projected by a USDA analyst in the following table:

Table 3

Type of Farm	*Number of Farms*	*Production* (billions of $)
"Larger than family size"	150,000	8
"Adequate" family size	680,000	24
"Minimum adequate" family size	600,000	9
Total:	1,430,000	$41

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The USDA euphemism "larger than family size" for agribusiness is worth noting, and that this projection sees no change in their number or amount of sales. Similarly, the "adequate" family farms, which today average about $22,500 in annual sales, would number the same as at present but would increase their average marketings to over $35,000. The "minimum adequate" farms would be "created from 1.6 million *commercial* farms with marketings of less than $10,000 each" (emphasis added) and would require at least $15,000 in annual sales. The writer adds that "these projections could prove to be conservative," a hedge presumably required by public relations. Actually, it is quite clear that the number of corporation farms will increase both in number and proportion of total farms sales through 1975, and that $15,000 will not be sufficient to return a net farm income of $2,500. As mentioned before, the 1.3 million "non-commercial farms," which produce only 3 percent of gross sales, are already written off and are not included in the projections.

I stress the USDA's word-juggling because it is an important part of administration policy to obscure the decline of the family farm. If these small farms still had a viable future, "part-time" farms would not exist, farmers would not be forced to seek work elsewhere, and the sons of the "part-retirement" farmers would be operating farms in their own right. The USDA constructs categories such as "non-commercial" and "inadequate" in order to rationalize its failure to save the small farmer from the ravages of the agricultural revolution and the growth of the "larger than family size" farms.

A final word on the size of farms: The average size in 1959 was 303 acres, a record inter-census gain over the 1954 figure of 242 acres. There are now over 136,000 farms of over 1,000 acres, an increase of 4.4 percent in five years. But farms of under 500 acres dropped by 30 percent. Needless to say, the sharpest drop occurred among the smallest farms. Since total land in farms decreased by only 3.3 percent, it is evidently land consolidation that accounts for the increase in average farm size. In California today, only 6 percent of the farms control 76 percent of the farm acreage.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Los Angeles Times of March 19, 1961, summed up the situation well:

> Farming here is usually an intensive, specialized, commercial undertaking conducted for the purpose of obtaining income from the employment of labor, managerial ability, and capital. . . . "Agri-business" is the term used to describe the fairly new look in California agriculture to-day, and its meaning is self-evident. If he is not a multi-millionaire entrepreneur with offices in Los Angeles or San Francisco, the farmer must, at least, be a competent businessman capable of making large capital outlays and directing his operations in the manner of a corporate executive.

Farm Labor

In 1959, about 185,000 farms (5 percent of the total) paid almost three quarters of all farm wages. Over half of all farms hired no workers at all. So although USDA statistics are inexplicably vague as to the nature of the farms that depend on hired labor, it is reasonable to assume that the groupings in other characteristics, such as "larger than family size" (150,000), farms over 1,000 acres (136,000), and sales over $40,000 (102,000), indicate that large corporate farms dominate the farm labor market.

This identification is important because it assigns responsibility for the economic deprivations and political exclusions of 2 million farm workers and their families. It is not, as agri-business spokesmen claim in their public relations campaigns, the inability of small farmers to pay higher wages that results in the spectacle of "Harvest of Shame." The small farmer, whose income is not much higher than that of the hired farm worker, cannot afford to hire anyone at any price. Agri-business is just hiding behind the dirt farmer's skirts. In fact the corporate farm, with its cheap hired labor, is in direct competition with the family farm. But the big farmers call themselves "the farm lobby," although they represent less than 5 percent of the farms and have become so powerful that in the last session of Congress they killed a bill which would extend some child labor protections to farm workers.

It needs to be emphasized that agri-business is winning its battle against the family farm with the support of the federal government. Since subsidies and soil bank programs are general-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ly tied to production or acreage, the largest farms receive the largest subsidies. This increases the pressure to expand operations and to buy up small farms. The trend is clearly indicated by the September (a peak harvest month) ratio of family workers to hired workers on the nation's farms. Between 1954 and 1958, the average ratio was: family workers—71 percent of farm employment, hired workers—29 percent. In 1961, the ratio was 54:46, and soon the hired workers will outnumber the family workers. In California, this is already the case; over 65 percent of farm labor is now hired.

Hired farm workers are the most exploited group in the American capitalist system. The average regular farm worker earned just $881 from 134 days of farm work in 1961. Nonfarm work for a few additional weeks brought his total average income to $1,054, an actual drop from $1,125 in the previous year. The next lowest rung on the occupational ladder was occupied by domestic workers, who averaged $2,100 for the year. Hourly earnings for farm workers ranged from 43¢ in Mississippi to $1.27 in Washington, against a national average of 83¢. Migrant farm workers, the "poorest of the poor," are forced by low wages and sporadic job opportunities to seek work away from their homes; they earn even less, an average of $677 a year for "normal" (123 days) employment.

These workers, who have been so aptly described for some three decades as the "forgotten people" are victims not only of the agricultural revolution but of racial persecution and its attendant evils as well. Over half are Negroes or Mexican-Americans. A recent study of the eastern seaboard migrant stream showed that of a sample of 202 migrants, 161 were former sharecroppers driven off the land by mechanized plantations, and another 31 were children of sharecropper families who could neither be supported at home nor find any employment near it. The central migrant stream, originating in the Rio Grande valley of Texas, is predominantly Mexican-American, and is the largest in size. The Pacific coast stream contains a higher proportion of "Anglos," many of whom are the same people portrayed in the *Grapes of Wrath*.

In spite of, or perhaps because of, their economic status and obvious need, farm workers are *specifically excluded* from

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

almost every labor law and welfare protection won by industrial workers. Although farm workers receive less than a third of factory pay, they are excluded from minimum-wage laws; although they suffer the highest rate of unemployment, they receive no unemployment compensation; although they work in the nation's third most hazardous industry (after mining and construction), they receive no workmen's compensation; although their children are the most educationally deprived group in the nation, no meaningful child labor laws apply to them; and few receive the social security benefits for which they finally became eligible in 1958.

In no other industry are hundreds of thousands of impoverished workers imported from underdeveloped countries, as the government helps agri-business to import Mexican *braceros,* British West Indians, and Puerto Ricans. About 300,000 of these foreign workers, willing to work for whatever is offered (until recently, about 50¢ an hour) were imported last year under the so-called "emergency" Mexican Farm Labor Program (Public Law 78). What this cheap, docile, captive labor force has done to the wages and working conditions of the defenseless domestic farm worker is obvious. PL 78 is nothing more than a government subsidy to the tiny minority (less than 2 percent) of U.S. corporation farms that hire *braceros.*

But perhaps the most important legal disability of farm workers is the denial of their right to organize. Excluded from the collective bargaining provisions of the National Labor Relations Act, agri-business cannot legally be forced to the collective bargaining table even if every single one of their employees asks for union recognition. As the nature of agriculture more closely comes to resemble that of industry, this question becomes quite crucial. After all, mass organization of industry did not become a success until after the passage of the New Deal's labor legislation.

Over half a dozen unions have conducted organizing drives among farm workers, but, with one notable exception, have met with little success. The Knights of Labor began in the 1880's among the sugar workers of Louisiana where, today, the Amalgamated Meat Cutters, through their Agricultural Workers' Division (the remnants of the old Southern Tenant Farmers

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Union) is still trying. Packinghouse, which still has some lettuce shed workers in the Southwest, and the former leftist Food, Tobacco and Agricultural Workers Union had some success in the heyday of the 30's. The latest effort, originally backed by the AFL-CIO but dropped by George Meany when it did not immediately pay off, is the Agricultural Workers Organizing Committee in California. Today, AWOC is little more than a political campaign to get votes for the Democratic Party, with funds just trickling in from a few industrial unions and local councils. So far, the well financed opposition by agri-business, through such groups as the California Associated Farmers, has defeated AWOC.

The great exception to other unions' failures among farm workers is the west coast longshoremen's union (ILWU) in Hawaii, which has organized some 25,000 pineapple and sugar field workers. Their average hourly wage under the union sugar contract is $2.30, including fringe benefits, compared to 60¢ and $1 on the mainland. The organized power of the union has extended social legislation to Hawaian farm workers. The ILWU's success story is one that AFL-CIO leaders could read with profit, as perhaps the Teamsters are doing now. Last year they announced two contracts (described as "sweethearts") with California corporation farms, and there have been recurrent rumors of a joint ILWU-Teamster drive among west coast farm workers in the future.

The special position of the farm worker, who in the past may have shared the farmer's table, is rapidly changing. No longer the man with the hoe, he is now the man with the mechanized cotton picker, the almond-tree shaking machine, or the motorized potato harvester. He is being separated from the product of his labor just as the artisan was transformed into the assembly-line worker or button pusher. In England, where hired workers are a higher proportion of the farm labor force than in the U.S., and in other European countries, farm labor unions are already strong. A recent report on the European hired farm worker states: "The agricultural worker in an industrial society becomes much more strongly aware of his class situation. He is now a member of the working class . . . he no longer belongs to the farming class."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Social Effects of the Agricultural Revolution

Less than 30 years ago, James Agee was praising over a million famous men in his essays on the Southern sharecropper and tenant farmer. Today, there are barely 100,000 sharecroppers remaining in the South, for nowhere has the agricultural revolution had a more far-reaching effect than in the 16 Southern states. Between 1940 and 1959, the national drop in the number of farms was 39 percent; in the South, the decline was 45 percent. Negro farms have been the hardest hit, dropping by 60 percent. Total farm employment dropped 41 percent in the nation between 1950 and 1960, but Southern agricultural employment was cut exactly in half. Fully 1.6 million Southern workers were forced out of farming, out of a nationwide total of 2.8 million lost jobs.

During the last decade, Negro migration from the South into the Northern industrial cities reached a record 1.5 million, most of whom were displaced farm workers. They are now suffering up to 30 percent unemployment in the slums of Chicago, Detroit, and other cities. Half of all teen-age Negroes living in Mississippi in 1950 had left the state ten years later. So too had the equivalent of one third of the state's entire Negro population, one quarter of the Negro populations of Alabama and South Carolina, and one fifth of the Negro population of North Carolina and Georgia.

Each day, trains pull into Chicago's Clark Street station filled with new migrants from the Mississippi delta and other areas of the rural South. In general, they are victims of generations of sub-human living conditions, segregation and racial persecution. They lack education, occupational skills, and experience in urban living. In Chicago they crowd into the slums of the deteriorating West Side to live under conditions as bad as or worse than they were fleeing to escape in the South. Many are on relief, for unskilled jobs are becoming increasingly scarce in a stagnant and automating economy. Older migrants face the prospect of living on relief for the rest of their lives. But their only alternative is to join the migrant farm worker stream!

These scenes are repeated across the nation, in every industrial city. They reveal the human fruits of the agricultural revolution in a society unable to adjust to important structural

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

change. No one is sorry to see the feudal system of sharecropping pass into oblivion, but the social dislocation that it causes is a damning indictment of capitalist society.

For those still remaining on the land, a good description has been drawn by Secretary of Agriculture Freeman, "More than half of the nation's poverty today is rural poverty. . . . Underemployment in the countryside and its small towns is so great that it is the equivalent of around 4 million unemployed . . . per capita personal income of the farm population was $1,373 last year, or only 59 percent of the $2,345 for the nonfarm population." The Secretary describes very well the results of an irrational, unplanned society, but how does he propose to meet the challenge?

The government's greatest effort in this direction has been the production of speeches, slogans, and dishonesty. The widely-heralded Rural Areas Development programs are little more than public subsidies to small-time businessmen looking for a cheap and non-union labor force. Few of them have been attracted by federal industrial loans to move to the declining rural areas. The Manpower and Retraining Act can hardly train workers for jobs that simply don't exist. And the federal government, not wishing to be labeled "socialist," entrusts control of the welfare efforts it does make to local officials. What this means in areas such as the rural South is obvious: more federal support of segregation and denial of equal employment rights to Negroes.

Mankind knows now how to control social and economic change and to turn it to human advantage. Yet billions of dollars are being spent to prevent the growing of more food and fiber when many people in this country, to say nothing of the rest of the world, desperately need it. We are allowing millions of people to be uprooted from their homes to suffer even greater poverty and unemployment when even existing industrial capacity is not being utilized. We are supporting a few millionaires in agri-business when millions of working farmers and hired workers live like animals. That these things are happening in America today is reason enough for us to dedicate ourselves to work for a rational and human socialist society.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CUBA'S MISSION

Last March we printed a letter by a young American woman who married a Cuban and went to Havana to live. When we were in Cuba gathering material for *Cuba: Anatomy of a Revolution,* she helped us in a thousand ways. Now we print another letter from her, received on the eve of the holiday season. It is the best statement we have seen anywhere of the specifically Cuban view of the recent world crisis.—The Editors

Well! So much that might be said and yet, as one's mind roams over the possible things to say, only one seems really essential: Cuba is still thriving. After so many moments of acute tension, but never cowardice or fear, after so much discussion of what might occur and what should occur and what did occur, what matters is that in the past days of gravest danger the government and the people of Cuba, in the most extraordinary fusion of will and decision, maintained without an instant's wavering the long-since-taken determination to resist to the end, whatever might come.

What happened here was simply *emocionante* and beautiful—there isn't any other way to describe it. The few days of most intense danger, when it seemed that the madmen in Washington might lose their heads at any moment (when barbed wire was being strung along the beaches of Key West!) were days of swift and silent movement here. A whole country moved into positions already planned with a quiet serenity which astonished even ourselves. The mobilization was scarcely noticeable except for the people who were suddenly missing and had gone to join their units. Overnight, virtually the entire country, except for children and the very old, was dressed in uniform. The lines for blood donations were longer. Thousands who had not been in the militia joined it and began immediate training. Otherwise, all was calm, expectant, waiting; and, at the same time, normal work activities went on. Signs appeared on factories and plants: "They shall not pass!" Inside, wives, sisters, daughters, mothers replaced younger men who had gone to join their units, and in factory after factory production goals

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

were met and passed. Children went to school as usual, although secondary schools, whose students were in the mountains collecting the coffee crop, were still on vacation. Only the universities suspended classes, with the mobilization of the university militia.

I am teaching this term in the new Pre-Medical Institute where specially-selected (in competitive examinations) scholarship students from all over the country are being prepared in intensive courses for entrance into the School of Medicine. Although many of the professors and all of the students belong to the militia, we received instructions that our classes must be continued and only in case of a full state of war would we be mobilized.

When the news came of the Soviet Union's agreement to withdraw its missile sites from Cuba, it made scarcely a ripple. Their only value here, in any event, was as a possible deterrent to U. S. aggression, and once they became the *excuse* for aggression, it was better to have them removed. One heard some expressions of resentment at the Soviet Union's having agreed to remove them "without the courtesy of consulting Cuba first." But by far the general opinion was: "The Soviet Union has a great deal at stake, too. If they think it is better to remove them, let them remove them. We don't need them, and we had decided upon our own course of action long before they were supplied to us."

What is perhaps not sufficiently well understood in the States is the point of view which guides Cuba. When we hear U. S. leaders refer to Cuba as an "instrument" of the Soviet Union, or Kennedy refer to us as a "captive" people, we smile and shrug. Kennedy and the leaders there unquestionably know better, but probably the people of the U. S. don't. How can they understand that, in this case, the Soviet Union is willingly and paradoxically an "instrument" of Cuba insofar as any country in the socialist world is an "instrument" of another? The Soviet Union has placed itself at the disposal of Cuba and will defend her as far as the limits of intelligence permit. What those limits are no one can say except within the framework of a given moment. I think it is absurd to assume that the foreign policy of the Soviet Union is so inflexible as still to

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

accept Brest-Litovsk as its guiding principle under any circumstance. The conditions which determine foreign policy are constantly in flux.

But all of that, to a very great extent, is beside the point as far as Cuba is concerned. We are intensely grateful to the Soviet Union for all it has done and all it may do for Cuba and in the interests of world socialism, but our course of seeing Cuba freed permanently of U. S. domination or of dying in the endeavor was set long before the Soviet Union came to our aid. Therefore, in the final analysis, although our *fate* might conceivably be tied to what the Soviet Union does or does not do, our *course* is not. In other words, Cuba is determined to be an example for the rest of the subdeveloped world, but very especially for Latin America, alive or dead. Our task is messianic, but in order to show the way, the Messiah must be first of all an example. Isn't it extraordinary that a whole people can be convinced of this necessity and dedicate their lives to it? Of course, the Soviet Union did it first, but the Soviet Union is a very large country and it is necessary now that a small country, geographically remote from the other socialist countries, do it again.

Then there are other factors, too. We, like all of the other socialist countries, believe firmly that time is on the side of socialism if only the U. S. can be kept from destroying the world prematurely. The task, therefore, is to use every possible recourse to try to avoid war, and fortunately there are a number of important recourses which can be appealed to before the extremity of war. But Cuba is the *last* country which desires the Soviet Union to defend it at the cost of war. We are trying to help create a world in which reason and human creative will may prevail over the jungle instincts of violence and brute force, and so we cannot wish for the ultimate stupidity of war under any circumstances—certainly not to see the evil of monopoly capitalism destroyed, since we are certain that it will disappear by itself, given sufficient time. Cuba does not ask humanity or socialism to sacrifice itself for her sake; on the contrary, she is prepared to sacrifice herself if need be for humanity and socialism. But one thing, I think, is very certain: if the U. S. were to destroy Cuba, it would destroy itself in the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

process. We represent everything the U. S. once believed in and would have to believe in again to save itself; we are the "picture" to the United States' Dorian Gray.

So. We return to something like normal existence again, in spite of Mr. Kennedy's continuing threats. It is possible that some other tremendous "excuse" will be found at any moment, but it seems most likely that the powers-that-be in Washington will be content for the time being with a tremendous wave of repression in Latin America in an attempt to establish a kind of *cordon sanitaire* against the contamination of Communism. Well, not really *content*: we are quite sure we won't be allowed to work and construct (really) in peace, but within the limits of what their harassments allow, we shall work at making Cuba an example and, of course, we infinitely prefer to be a *living* example to a dead one. For the fact that we are able to work again, we are enormously grateful to the Soviet Union, and all of humanity must be grateful, too. And yet—and yet, perhaps the threat was not quite as serious as it seemed. Kennedy said that Communism in the Western Hemisphere was not negotiable, and yet he took care to present an issue which *could* be negotiated. There were others which could not be.

Political and social changes elsewhere worry most Americans. The revolt of the colonial people, who are in fact the ultimate heirs of 1776, and their desire to fashion their own way of life, seems to be frightening and incomprehensible to the descendants of those who started it all at Lexington and Concord.

—U Thant, December 2, 1962

We can be twice as strong as all the Great Powers combined and still witness Asia, Africa, and South America in the throes of revolutions that our armaments cannot stop.

—Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas: Democracy's Manifesto.

I can not bring myself to believe that mankind is so base that none of his representatives will struggle for a more excellent way of life, no matter the chances of success.

—Bertrand Russell

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

C. WRIGHT MILLS AND THE AMERICAN LEFT

BY EUGENE V. SCHNEIDER

It is natural that the Left in this country and elsewhere should feel an affinity with the work of C. Wright Mills. His values were those which have historically defined the Left. For Mills, as for the Left, the supreme values of human life were rationality and freedom. Rationality and freedom are the necessary conditions for the solution of the enormous problems facing mankind; even more, they are the quintessence of human nature. Mills was against those things which the Left is against: the corruption of modern society, the alienation of masses of people within, the vulgarization of life, the constriction of freedom, the drift toward slump and thermonuclear war. His works are replete with the disgust, the moral indignation, the sense of outrage, which have long been the motivating forces of the Left intellectual. And, finally, many intellectuals found in Mills a voice which, for once, had sufficient power and range to make some impact on the deafened ears of America.

And yet it seems clear that Mills cannot be uncritically accepted as *the* voice of the American Left. Granting the compatibilities of Mills and the Left, we must ask if the Left is willing to accept the assumptions which underlie Mills' thought? Men of sensibility, as Mills would say, may agree on the nature of present-day society, and yet disagree on the process by which this society was brought into being and in what direction it will develop. And if there is such disagreement, then it is virtually certain that there will be disagreement on what must be done, on what *can* be done, by those who wish to change the drift of things. The aim of this article is not to offer a critique of Mills—that would be quite impossible in the space of a few pages—but to present in highly condensed form the main features of his beliefs about modern society, in order to help the Left debate his ideas and make up its mind about them.

The author is Professor of Sociology at Bryn Mawr College.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Theoretical Approach

Mills was above all a social scientist, that is, he believed that society could be made the object of rational inquiry. It is important to keep this in mind precisely because Mills leveled such bitter attacks on present-day social science, whether of the academic or "Marxist" varieties. Those who doubt that society can be studied scientifically are going to be disappointed in Mills, no matter how much they may enjoy his attacks on current social sciences.

But he was a social scientist of his own kind. He rejected most academic social science on two grounds. First, he scornfully rejected that social science which lacks historical perspective of any kind, which views society as essentially an equilibrium, maintained by a set of functioning institutions. For such social science there are no internal contradictions, only deviance; there are no long-term forces of social change, only variations about equilibrium; there is no succession of historically unique societies, only variations of "society." Second, he rejected academic social science because it refused to take a moral stand on what it was studying. For Mills this was not only a moral fault, it was a sin against science, for it confined the social sciences to studying things as they are, without ever coming to grips with things as they might be. Yet the potentialities in any given situation are also real. By failing to recognize this fact, academic social science doomed itself to a static view of society, to the trivial, the obvious, the half-baked. Even worse, it seemed to justify the present, with all its absurdity, inhumanity, and danger, as somehow necessary or even right.

It might seem that this position must lead Mills to the acceptance of Marxism as the only possible valid social science. And in a certain sense, it did; Mills explicitly labeled himself a "plain Marxist." But it is necessary to understand what Mills meant by this term.

For Mills, Marxism was three things: an approach to social phenomena, a method for studying them, and a system of values by which to judge societies and to formulate programs of action. The Marxist approach to the study of society was an historical and a functional one. It held that all societies were constantly changing, by evolution or by revolution, into new

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

forms. Each form was marked by specific types of social structure, human personalities, processes of change and resistance to change, and specific functional relationships between all of these. Each society, then, was governed by "laws" specific to itself. As a method, Marxism demanded that once a model of any specific society was constructed, deductions be made from this model which could be used to predict the course of events, but only until such time as the model would be rendered obsolete by evolution or revolution. As a philosophy, Marxism judged each society in terms of its capacity to provide the basic elements of a truly human condition, by which Marx meant not only material necessities, but the widest possible opportunity for the exercise of reason and freedom.

Marxism, in Mills' view, did *not* mean that one set of "laws," deducted from one master model, was applicable to all types and stages of capitalist society, let alone other types of society. The trouble with almost all the existing varieties of Marxism was that they sought to use a model which Marx derived largely from one form of capitalist society, to analyze quite different types of society. Because these models are obsolete, the predictions derived from them about the course of modern history have been fallacious. Thus they have led to what Mills regarded as fallacious predictions about the increasing alienation and pauperization of the working class, the constant worsening of economic crises and ultimate stagnation, the ever constant and sharpening class struggle, and the outbreak of revolutions in advanced capitalist societies.

Mills believed that underlying these fallacies is a false model of modern society. Thus he denies that in our time men are dominated by their relationships to the means of production. He asks, can the behavior of blue-collar workers, white-collar workers, capitalists, managers, generals, Negroes, be understood in these terms? He denies that the "superstructure" of society—the prevailing ideas and institutions—is always the reflection of the economic base. Is it true, for instance, that the state has always been the servant of the capitalist class, that it is never able to restrain its capitalists? He denies that, today, social being always determines consciousness. How, he asks, can one account for "false consciousness"? What about the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ability of the mass media to *create* consciousness in relation to certain issues and objects? He denies that men in our time can make history only within the limits set by changes in the economic base of society. This, he argues, is gravely to underestimate the role of leaders and men of power in the making of modern history. Mills did not deny that all of these assumptions of the classical Marxist model may have been valid in another period; but he held that they are not eternal principles of society and that they certainly do not adequately describe our own times.

By this time the reader may be left wondering in what sense Mills was a Marxist. Perhaps instead of calling himself a "plain Marxist," Mills should have said along with Marx and in the precise sense that Marx meant it: "I, at least, am not a Marxist!"

American Society

Using what he considered to be the Marxian approach, method, and philosophy, Mills set about constructing what he thought was a more adequate model of advanced industrial society. It is possible here only to indicate briefly some of the major elements in this model. It will be found described in detail in his trilogy, *New Men of Power, White Collar,* and *The Power Elite.*

First, it must be understood that Mills believed that all advanced industrial societies, capitalist or non-capitalist, are subject to many of the same dynamic forces. Above all, modern society is marked by a process of rationalization (which is not the same thing as ordinary rationality). Rationalization is manifest in the growth of large-scale bureaucracies, revolutions in technology, developing techniques for the manipulation of people, the great growth of science. In the economic sphere, the result has been the bureaucratization and concentration of many phases of production. In the military sphere, the result has been the modern military machine—vast, bureaucratized, armed with the weapons of mass destruction. In the political sphere, there has appeared the state bureaucracy and the mass media as a means of manipulating people. Only society as a whole, at least in the capitalist countries, has resisted this process of rationalization.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

From these central conditions of advanced industrial society flows a train of consequences, of which the most fateful are (1) the rise of an elite of powerful men who are in control of the means of death, production, and political power; and (2) below them an unorganized "mass" ruled over and controlled by this elite to an extent unique in human history.

The power elite are those who control the great organizations; they are the men at the head of the great corporations, the armed forces, the state, the mass media of communication. They are the men who make the "big decisions"—whether to go to war, to drop a bomb, to make peace, to join an alliance, to adopt a new economic policy. And they have the power to make sure that the rest of society accepts their decisions, if, indeed, they bother to secure assent at all. Their appearance is inevitable in advanced industrial society, but in the United States their position is, for a variety of reasons, peculiarly invulnerable: there is the absence of competing elites, the lack of a civil service, the sudden rise of America to a position of world power without the traditions or institutions to play such a role.

The power elite is *not* an economic class, based on ownership of property. Those who control the military forces have no property rights in their organization, and the same is true of the political directorate. Nor does the capitalist class simply control the giant economic bureaucracies. It is more accurate to say that the corporations have reorganized the capitalist class; its wealth is now largely corporate wealth. It is the interests and programs of the corporate elite which dominate the capitalist class more than the other way about. But who are the members of this elite? Some of them, to be sure, are drawn from the capitalist class; their wealth and connections have been their tickets of admission to the world of corporate power. Some of them have come up through their own organizations. Some have come in from other giant organizations, particularly the military. This shift of power from the capitalist class to the economic elite is reflected in the declining prestige of the "very rich," the legendary families, the "400's." For members of these declining elites to wield power, they must enter the corporate world, or one of the other great organizations.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Yet to some degree this power elite does form a unified group, with a similarity of outlook, programs, and values. They have similar interests, first of all in maintaining themselves in power and then in substantive matters of policy. Thus a permanent war economy reflects the interests of the economic elite in an assured and profitable market; at the same time it guarantees the position of the military elite, and provides the state with the necessary leverage for conducting foreign policy. Unity is also based on the similarity of the types of men who make up the elite. As heads of large-scale organizations, they have a great deal of experience in common. They have had similar educational and occupational careers. They tend to come from the same religious, ethnic, and occupational backgrounds. Because they are the same type of men, and because their interests coincide at many points, they find it easy and profitable to interchange positions, and this serves to unify them further. Probably they are not formally organized; their unity is achieved by go-betweens, through informal associations, through the interchange of positions.

The state plays a peculiar role in Mills' model. The state is, of course, one of the great organizations of advanced industrial society, and as such it forms a major source of power in society. But the state has now spawned an independent elite. There is no civil service, independent of passing administrations, on the level of policy decisions. Most professional politicians operate on the middle levels of power. Rather, the political elite is composed of a mixture of top-level politicians and members of the military and economic elites. Yet this does not mean that the state is merely the tool of the economic-military elite, much less of the capitalist class. No matter what the source of the political elite, the state remains, to some degree, an independent source of power and policy. There is certainly much coincidence of interest and outlook between the political directorate and the other elites; but this does not mean that the political elite is not able to initiate and pursue a policy of its own.

Forming a sort of penumbra to the power elite are the go-betweens, the advisers and consultants of the elite, powerful politicians, local and regional upper classes, and celebrities whose faces are known to the general public. On occasion members of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

these groups may be raised into the power elite.

Below this elite of powerful men are the middle levels of power where various special interest groups struggle among themselves for advantage and position. Occasionally the powerful may intervene in their struggles for tactical reasons and, of course, the power elite will brook no opposition from that quarter. But within these limits, the middle levels are quite free to carry on their struggles. It is here that are found the labor unions, the farm organizations, the Congress, and all the myriad of special local or regional interests that it represents. These groups have readily abdicated from making the big decisions; they have traded national power for immediate advantage and, from this point of view, many of them have done well.

Below these top and middle levels of power is the "mass society." It includes all those who have little or no power over the decision-makers at the top, those who receive from the top orders, information, interpretations of events, sometimes in recognizable form, sometimes not. On the one hand, the mass is more or less firmly controlled, depending on the needs of the power elite, by various institutions such as education, religion, unions, the press, the movies, radio, and TV. On the other hand, the mass lacks its own organizations, leadership, or ideology. As a result, the mass can be manipulated by the top for whatever purposes it chooses: to secure assent for a decision . . . a market . . . a source of military manpower, or for whatever other reason.

It should be noted that by a "mass society" Mills does not necessarily mean a homogeneous society. There may be plenty of distinctions within a mass society; distinctions of age, sex, race, occupation, region, even class. The point is that in a mass society these distinctions do not and cannot serve as a basis for organization to counter the power of the elite.

The mass society, like the power elite, has risen from forces lying deeply imbedded within the social structure. First, mass society is the obverse of the power elite; as power has been concentrated at the top, the mass has been denuded of it. But, second, mass society is the outcome of certain changes in the class structure. The old middle class of small property and wealth, which at one time supported populist or even anti-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

capitalist movements, has decreased in numbers and largely lost whatever organization and influence it once possessed. In its place has appeared a very numerous and growing class of white collar workers, clinging frantically to the prestige of the older middle class, but without even its economic base. This class has no traditions, no organizations, no unity. It is probably the most easily controlled group in society; given a small amount of status, the opportunity to remain distinct from the working class, even a vague hope of "rising," it will remain quiescent.

What has happened to the working class, the class upon which Marxists everywhere have placed their hopes, and which Mills himself at one time (in *The New Men of Power*) considered the only bar to slump and war? Organized labor has, of course, entered the middle levels of power; it has become bureaucratized and its leaders quite happily abdicate any claims to positions within the power elite in return for freedom of action within their own little spheres. Organized labor has, in fact, become one of the institutions of mass society; its function there is to control the working class in behalf of the power elite. At the same time, the rank and file of the working class has lost much of whatever unity and militancy (which was never very much, in Mills' estimate) it once possessed. In numbers, it is a declining class; it is split by ethnic and racial divisions; those sections which are employed and organized are smug, those which are neither are shattered; it has accepted the values of the "mass society" and yearns vaguely for the white collar for itself or its children, for a home in the suburbs. It possesses virtually no organizations outside of its unions, and it has lost control even of them.

The institutions of society have lost or abdicated whatever position they once had as centers of rational thought, freedom, and initiative. The schools long ago abandoned any opposition to the Establishment. Religion has traded its concern with the freedom and development of the human soul for a mess of comfort and respectability. The universities have been lulled or forced into quietude by liberal grants for research in behalf of the interests of the power elite, by the rise of the academic bureaucrat, by a relentless war against their inde-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pendent teachers. Science has become a machine in the service of the power elite.

Mills' Program of Action

Who then, according to Mills, has the will and the capacity to oppose the power elite, the mass society, the inexorable drift toward slump and war? Mills argues that the only group in society with at least the will, if not the power, is the intelligentsia. Intellectuals are defined as all those whose concern is with discovering and articulating the meaning and development of societal forces, and in relating these forces to the personal problems that people face; intellectuals are those who offer alternatives for the development of society and thus for the self, and who suggest programs of action for attaining these alternatives. Insofar as intellectuals function as intellectuals, they cannot help but recognize and oppose the role of the power elite in this society and the drift toward slump and war that it has set in motion. By the same token, the intellectuals cannot help but oppose the mass society, with its denial of rationality and freedom to all but a very few, with the limited and distorted selves that it produces. The mere dealers in ideas—those who have become technicians in the service of the Establishment, or those who have, through disgust or disillusionment, ceased to face these problems—are not intellectuals; they have forfeited their right to that name.

But, do the intellectuals, in Mills' sense of the term, have any power with which to make their opposition more than a personal gesture of defiance? According to Mills' own prescription, opposition implies the creation of true publics, nationally responsible parties, a true civil service, access to the mass media of communications, and organizations capable of opposing the power elite. The whole experience of our times teaches us that these cannot be achieved by intellectuals alone, and especially not by the handful of remaining intellectuals in America. And yet, to repeat, this is *the only group* left to carry on a struggle; there are no allies to be found in mass society.

How, then, can the gap be closed between the power and the intellect? Oddly enough, Mills believed that here, the existence of an elite of power offered one opportunity. For it

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

could really intervene decisively in the affairs of society and in its dangerous drifts: ours is not a society at the mercy of Fate, of the inexorable processes of history. It is therefore to the power elite, not to the mass society, that the intellectuals must address themselves. It is their duty to educate the power elite to the consequences of their actions; it is the duty of the intellectuals to demand of the men of power that they face the moral issues involved in their decisions. It is the duty of the intellectuals to place before the men of power alternative interpretations of events and alternative courses of action; e.g. alternatives to the military metaphysic and the crackpot realism which dominate the thinking of the elite. In this struggle, the intellectuals must be clever; they must take advantage of internal splits within the power elite, of the jockeying for position that goes on there, of the occasional misgivings which arise among them. As a secondary task, the intellectuals must continue to demand that the "independent institutions" rehabilitate themselves; that politicians reassume responsibility for the state, that ministers pick up again their concern with the human soul, that teachers begin again to educate, that scientists once again turn to the business of inquiry. And as opportunity offers, the intelligentsia should seek to reach the mass, who will, after all, bear the brunt of the decisions made at the top.

In sum, Mills offers us a view of society that is elitist in several senses. First, he views society as dominated by a power elite. Second, he calls upon an intellectual elite to influence the men of power. Third, he sees in the power elite not only a danger to mankind but, perhaps, the only real opportunity to avoid catastrophe. For the power elite can really make and remake history as it chooses. In this respect, rule by the power elite, dangerous as it is, may be preferable to rule by non-rational masses, open to the influence of demagogues.

All this is a far cry from the traditional leftist views of the historical process in general and American society in particular. Is the Left ready to accept Mills' views and programs? If not, what alternative model of American society does it prefer? How does it define its own role within that society? What alternative program of action is it ready to offer the American people?

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

AN ATTEMPTED CONVERSION

[Owen's children were brought up in orthodoxy by their pious mother, and Robert Dale Owen describes an attempt to convert his free-thinking father in a passage that tells us much both about Owen's religion and his attitude to his children.]

I sounded my father by first asking him what he thought about Jesus Christ. His reply was to the effect that I would do well to heed his teachings, especially those relating to charity and to our loving one another.

This was well enough, as far as it went; but it did not at all satisfy me. So, with some trepidation, I put the question direct, whether my father disbelieved that Christ was the Son of God?

He looked a little surprised and did not answer immediately. "Why do you ask that question, my son?" he said at last.

"Because I am sure—"I began eagerly.

"That he *is* God's Son?" asked my father, smiling.

"Yes, I am."

"Did you ever hear of the Mahometans?" said my father, while I paused to collect my proofs.

I replied that I had heard of such people who live somewhere, far off.

"Do you know what their religion is?"

No."

"They believe that Christ is not the Son of God, but that another person, called Mahomet, was God's chosen prophet."

"Do they not believe the Bible?" asked I, somewhat aghast.

"No. Mahomet wrote a book called the Koran; and Mahometans believe it to be the word of God. That book tells them that God sent Mahomet to preach the gospel to them and to save their souls."

Wonders crowded fast upon me. A rival Bible and a rival Saviour. Could it be? I asked. "Are you *quite* sure this is true, papa?"

"Yes, my dear, I am quite sure."

"But I suppose there are very few Mahometans: not near—*near* so many as there are of Christians."

"Do you call Catholics Christians, Robert?"

"Oh no, papa. The Pope is Antichrist."

My father smiled. "Then by Christians you mean Protestants."

"Yes."

"Well, there are many more Mahometans than Protestants in the world: about a hundred and forty million Mahometans and less than a hundred million Protestants."

"I thought almost everyone believed in Christ, as mama does."

"There are probably twelve hundred millions of people in the world. So, out of every twelve persons only one is a Protestant. Are you quite sure that the one is right and the eleven wrong?"

My creed, based on authority, was toppling. I had no answer ready. . . . And so ended this notable scheme of mine for my father's conversion.

an extract from

The Life and Ideas of

ROBERT OWEN

by A. L. Morton

Prepub price $2.25 Price $3.50

To be published March 1963 Monthly Review Press

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

AMERICAN RADICALISM: LIBERAL OR SOCIALIST?

BY RONALD RADOSH

In the past few years, discussion among radicals has indicated that many people believe the potentiality now exists for the development of a new, strong, and united socialist movement in the United States. If such a movement is to develop, American radicals must examine how their past approach has hindered its development.

A glance back at American history suggests that rather than having played a radical role, the Left has supported humanitarian efforts at reform, while refraining from any fundamental criticism of the capitalist system. By superimposing European theories such as "the united front against fascism" on the American scene, the Left fallaciously stressed the danger of a business-supported fascist coup. Continuing in this tradition, the Left today calls for unity against the reactionary ultra-Right, a social force which is also said to present the danger of a Nazi-like revolt.

American radicals justify their ideological orientation by pointing to the pressure from the Left which is said to have forced Franklin D. Roosevelt to institute the Second New Deal, during which reform measures in the people's interest were passed. Opposed by the business community, so the theory goes, FDR responded to the masses and bitterly fought The Liberty League, the ultra-Right of the 30's. The goal for radicals in 1962, therefore, must be similarly to force President John F. Kennedy to rebuff the drive of the ultra-Right and institute an era of peaceful coexistence with the socialist world. This analysis leads to the conclusion that the Left should forgo the building of a socialist movement, aimed at changing the social structure of capitalism. Rather, the Left should forge a broad united front of all groups threatened by the fascistic ultra-Right, and save

The author is a doctoral candidate in American history at the University of Wisconsin.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the raising of socialism for a distant time when it will clearly be relevant for discussion.

The basis for the belief that the Kennedy administration can be persuaded to abandon a foreign policy of global anti-Communism is again due to an analogy with the New Deal. Franklin D. Roosevelt is said to have modified an imperialist foreign policy, waged an anti-fascist war in the people's interest, and administered a government which antagonized the business interests and served the "common people." Roosevelt's domestic policies (social security, TVA, collective bargaining, public works programs) are cited as evidence that an expansionist policy had been abandoned in favor of support for reform measures desired by the people.

Radicals who think in these terms postulate a conflict between foreign expansion and reform which the New Deal leadership did not believe existed. In the 1920's, Progressive ideologist Herbert Croly had already pointed out that expansion was an impulse to domestic reform. The international mission of the United States and domestic reform, he thought, were interlocking forces. Imperial ventures were steps in the fulfillment of the promise of American life, because expansion abroad provided a larger pie to divide among all the interest groups in America. True to this corporative tradition, New Deal reformers were convinced that the attainment of a functioning system at home required an economic empire abroad. The New Deal, as Dr. Lloyd Gardner has pointed out ("From New Deal to New Frontiers, 1937-1941," *Studies On the Left,* Vol. 1, No. 1, 1959), employed a split-level approach to domestic problems. While FDR attacked economic royalists, his administration fought desperately to preserve their interests from destruction. New Dealers, frustrated by failure to gain prosperity at home through domestic reform, turned to the traditional American policy of pursuing frontiers abroad as the solution to the crisis of the 1930's.

New Dealers therefore passed extensive legislation to aid the American exporter's search for foreign markets, exclaiming that the key to domestic security was expansion of trade and the attainment of new markets for surplus products and investments. Fearing economic dislocation due to loss of foreign

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

markets, Assistant Secretary of State Francis Sayre urged support for Cordell Hull's Reciprocal Trade Program. Hull's act would help to recover foreign markets, aid in the attainment of new outlets for surplus production, and therefore lead to a prosperous economy at home. An accompaniment of this new-style economic imperialism was the opposition of America's corporate elite to nations threatening American penetration in various areas of the world. Fearing the expansion of the Germans and Japanese in Latin America and Asia, the corporation leaders viewed America's entrance into the war as a means of protecting the Open Door abroad.*

Instead of challenging the expansionist base of the corporate system, the American Left followed a policy which eventually caused its decimation as a viable political force. By subordinating itself to the New Deal's liberal expansionism, the Left forfeited its responsibility of presenting an alternative to a system which defined domestic welfare as dependent upon foreign expansion. During the New Deal, the Left uncritically beat the drums for Roosevelt, acting as a left-wing adjunct of the administration. While most socialists ended their attachment to the Socialist Party and became ordinary New Dealers, the Communists separated themselves from the regular liberal Rooseveltian only by their ideological and political tie to the Soviet Union, which gave their movement a rationale for an independent existence.

Leftists certainly acted as advanced humanitarians, concerned with easing the suffering of the unemployed, achieving better working conditions for labor, civil rights for the Negro people, and other social goals which would give the average man a better life. But they did *not* function in the radical role of demanding the establishment of a commonwealth which would not depend upon economic and ideological expansion to achieve a good life at home. Rather, the Left called for support of "left-wing" New Dealers who were said to be more susceptible to pressure from the people.

On these grounds, the Left offered its support to Henry

* For an extended discussion of American entrance into World War II, the reader is urged to consult chapter 5 of Professor William A. Williams' *The Tragedy of American Diplomacy* (Delta Books, 1962).

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A. Wallace, whom it acclaimed as promoter of a "century of the common man." Regarded favorably as a liberal, pro-labor New Dealer by the Left, and attacked as a radical by many of the Right, Wallace was in reality an expansionist who sought to maintain a harmony of interests between the various economic groups in American society. Labor unions, as part of the corporate system, were justified in demanding sufficient wages for workers, as long as they did not upset the balance of interest between government and industry. But when either business or labor stood "in the way of maximum production," Wallace advised that " we should remove that obstacle."

Essentially, Henry Wallace held that business, labor, agriculture, and government formed a four-way partnership. Although one group could for a time obtain a larger share of the national income, this "pressure game" would explode unless each united to provide a larger income to divide. The source of this income was the "assurance of large and expanding markets" for business, upon which private enterprise was dependent "for its very survival." As Secretary of Commerce, therefore, the common man's politician had as his goal to build a "revitalized foreign trade service" which he hoped would "play a more effective role, in cooperation with the State Department," in promoting "vigorously a high level of foreign trade on a sustained basis." Full employment, the New Dealer's desire, would be the result of government cooperation "with the export trade" to put on "an aggressive sales campaign abroad."

These export markets were a necessity because American industry produced in excess of domestic demand. As soon as productive capacity caught up with deferred consumer and producer demands, Americans would have to "again look to foreign markets in order to exchange our surplus industrial and agricultural production." Wallace therefore supported a loan to Great Britain in the post-war period. If Britain did not obtain funds to buy American goods, American productivity would go unused for lack of markets. The result would be depression. Answering the charge that a loan to Britain's Labor government would further socialism in Europe, Wallace clarified that "money is being loaned to Britain for the purpose of enabling

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

her to do business in the way we are doing, rather than to pursue any further the path of socialization or nationalization."

President John F. Kennedy follows as a direct descendant of New Deal expansionist progressives who sought social reform at home as a by-product of the search for New Frontiers abroad. While Kennedy supports Medicare, and a $900-million public works program, the basis for his hope that America will be prosperous is the acquisition of new foreign markets. Nowhere is this made more clear than in his address to Congress concerning the Trade Expansion Act of 1962. Speaking on January 25, President Kennedy commented favorably on Cordell Hull's efforts "to spur our exports," and called for a new program to provide the mechanism necessary for increased exports in a world threatened by the Common Market's external tariff barrier. Asking for power to bargain down tariffs in order to preserve ready access to foreign markets for American manufacturers, Kennedy expressed the view that each interest group would benefit because the effort to invigorate the economy "will be importantly affected by our ability to expand our exports."

The new trade policy would serve the interests "of our most efficient and expanding industries," which export twice as many products as the United States imports from Europe. Given a "fair and equal opportunity to compete in overseas markets," manufacturers will be able to keep costs and prices stable, and in addition, the trade expansion program is necessary if the American military program is to continue unabated. Moreover, the program would guarantee harmony of interests. "The American businessman," noted Mr. Kennedy, "will have a unique opportunity to compete on a more equal basis in a rich and rapidly expanding market abroad." Agriculture will benefit from the sales to the Western European market, and the factory worker will gain "from the expansion of our exports" because markets mean an increase of job opportunities at home. Again, as in New Deal days, the remedy for unemployment is not to be found in a domestic program to prevent depression, but in increased expansion of the American system abroad. Jobs depend upon exports; export industries are the strongest and pay the best wages. According to the theory, the working class

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

has a natural stake in the attainment of increased exports and investment opportunities for American business.

The liberal leadership, pledged to maintaining the Open Door abroad for American commerce, logically proceeds to formulate and execute a global anti-Communist foreign policy. In doing so, it incurs the hostility of that part of the world which is closing the door to American penetration and control of its economies.

In spite of all this, the American Left still believes that when reform measures are advocated by the Kennedy administration, it has responded to the pressure of the people. When reforms are enacted, these professed radicals interpret them as a victory. Thus President Kennedy's opposition to Big Steel is viewed as a concession to the workers rather than as a victory of the "progressive" over the "reactionary" elements in Big Business, as the editors of MONTHLY REVIEW have indicated. If the Medicare program passes in a future Congress, these leftists will most likely interpret its passage as a further victory for the people. While medical care for the aged is certainly desirable, radicals who back Kennedy in his fight for it forget that support of liberal reform advocated by an expansionist administration is quite different from the more difficult job of presenting a radical analysis and alternative to the welfare measures of a stagnant corporate economy.

Perhaps the nature of the Kennedy administration's program becomes clearer if we study the views of one of its more liberal exponents, Senator Hubert H. Humphrey. Candidly airing his views in a recent issue of *Look* (May 22, 1962), Humphrey calls for a "growing partnership between the United States government and business management, based on mutual respect and understanding," the purpose of which is to "expand our markets . . . around the globe." Attacking the misconceived view that the Democratic Party is anti-business, Humphrey writes that "as a liberal Democrat, I can say that nowhere among policy makers of the Kennedy administration do I find an 'anti-business' attitude." What is bad, is the stifling of competition, and Big Business doesn't need to do that.

What is required is to "drop the false idea that the Democratic administration is hostile to business, and get on with a

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

new government-business partnership." Demanding increased capital investment in Latin America, and aggressive promotion of investment in capital equipment, Humphrey calls for assistance to firms selling abroad, guarantees of medium-term credit, and tax incentives to encourage new investment. Noting that "our huge productive capacity cannot be kept at high operating levels—and jobs cannot be increased—unless we greatly increase our export markets," Humphrey asserts the expand-or-stagnate thesis which has been proclaimed by American progressives since the 1890's.

Repeating the myth that the United States is a people's capitalist system in which all Americans own stock and therefore control the large corporations, Humphrey suggests that the corporate economy benefits all Americans. Admitting that strong suspicion of the motives of the large corporation exists, Humphrey explains this as a residue from the 1890 trustbusting phase. According to him, Americans must accept the fact that "Big Business is here to stay." This conclusion is connected with the Senator's desire to increase export markets. It is the large corporation which is best suited to undertake an efficient export trade upon which Humphrey holds that prosperity depends. Therefore the success of a government policy directed toward increased exports *is* tied to the success of Big Business.

Humphrey, like the Progressives of our past, is concerned with the "misuse" of large corporate power which might restrain competition. By fair competition, impartial access to credit at home, and expansion of the economic frontier abroad, he hopes that there will be room for the little man to exist. Therefore Humphrey writes that "the most successful method of preventing monopoly has been and continues to be the growth of markets," which "has given us the benefits of very large business enterprises, without a fatal development of monopolistic behavior." Reality contradicts the Senator, for the conditions of industrial production and foreign expansion make the little man irrelevant to the national economy. The policy of aid to exporters is a policy of aid to the large corporation, which depends for its existence on the search for new markets and investment opportunities. Though his rhetoric defends small

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

business, reality makes the liberal Senator justify and affirm rule by, and expansion of, the large corporation.

What Hubert Humphrey teaches us is that the liberalism of the Kennedy administration is directly tied to the interests of the large corporation. Accepting this as reality, it should be evident that it is fruitless for the Left to call for an "anti-monopoly coalition" which would pressure the administration to side with the people against the monopolies. *Such a strategy ignores the reality that corporate power is represented by the liberal administration itself.* It is this corporate system, led by the Kennedy administration, which opposes disarmament, fights social revolution abroad, and generally seeks the best means available to wage the Cold War at home and abroad.

Instead of devising a method of challenging corporate expansion, the Left continues to interpret social reality in terms of the 1930's. Just as Marxists then sought to build a united front against fascism, the Left today attacks the threat of fascism said to emanate from insignificant and inconsequential rightist groups, ranging from the American Nazi Party and the Minutemen to the John Birch Society and the Goldwater elements within the Republican Party. Since these groups are defined as the major threat to American security, the Left uses the tactic of calling for defense of the liberal administration against the threat of fascism from the ultra-Right. In reality, the rightist groups *by themselves* are unimportant. Opposed by the major corporations whose interests are served by the Kennedy administration, the ultra-Right uses the liberal's anti-Communist outlook to gain support for extreme measures which would endanger the successful operation of Cold War policy. It is only when the Right demands that the liberals follow their assumptions to their logical conclusion that its ideas generate force. Barry Goldwater, for example, recently called for immediate military invasion of Cuba. Chester Bowles, representing the Kennedy administration, answered the Senator's call by *agreeing* that Cuba's socialist government must be opposed, but disagreeing with the proposal to send in the marines. Bowles cited the grave setback for American interests which would occur if Goldwater's demand was acted upon. Yet the fact that Bowles accepted Goldwater's definition of the Cuban regime

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and agreed with his solution (that the United States must seek to change the regime rather than live with it) provides ammunition for the Right, which simply points out that inactivity and vacillation are not the way to crush the Cuban socialist government. Without the liberal's definition of the problem, the Right would gain no support for its extremist program.

The recent Cuban crisis bears out this analysis. Because the liberal administration has spent so long in defining socialist Cuba as a menace to American security, the continuing existence of the revolutionary regime in Cuba must necessarily imply that the administration is not successfully defending United States interests. Therefore the failure of liberal policy to abolish socialism in Cuba by economic and political coercion brought the liberals to much the same position as the Right. According to Drew Pearson, Secretary of State Rusk believed that the existence of nuclear missiles in Cuba did not warrant the institution of a blockade, or any overall change in U.S. policy towards Cuba. Nevertheless, Lyndon Johnson's report that Democratic electoral victories were endangered because of the Cuba issue, added to McGeorge Bundy's advice to follow a tough policy, induced the President to bring the world to the brink of war. This policy was undertaken without the aid (but with the support) of the ultras. Had the administration from the start sought a rapprochement with Cuba, the ground would have been cut from under the ultras. There would have been no reason to fear that their program would win electoral support.

The ultras, frustrated by coexistence, raise the spectre of a domestic Communist threat to account for the failure of liberal expansion to create an America without problems. Carrying liberal ideology to its logical conclusion, they demand inauguration of policies which the sophisticated administration leadership dare not carry out. Despite the support which the ultras receive in some smaller businesses, and in various military quarters, their activity provides no proof that a threat of fascism exists, stemming from a prospective coup undertaken by the Right against the Kennedy administration.

When the establishment pundit, Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., writes that apart from the deleterious effect the ultras have when they attack free speech in local communities and thus affect

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

elementary and high school education curricula, they are an ineffectual group, he is stating a truth ignored by the Left. Schlesinger, Jr., realizes that it is his liberal administration which has the support of the large corporations and which effectively holds and wields power. Therefore he knows what many radicals do not see—that the Right offers no threat to liberal expansionist rule, which does not require fascism for its success. When Schlesinger, Jr., writes that the ultras' cries are a normal reaction to a "progressive" administration, it should be obvious to all radicals that it is *not* progressive policies which the present warfare-state administration is carrying out. (Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., "The 'Threat' of the Radical Right," *The New York Times Magazine,* June 16, 1962.)

In some instances, the sharing of anti-Communism as a basic assumption leads adherents of the administration to espouse policies indistinguishable from those advocated by the so-called fascist Right. One of the loudest noises made by Goldwater was his attack on the "appeasement" plan of Walt Rostow written for the Policy Planning Council. Goldwater attacked the professor's policy paper as "the most dangerous document in America," and accused Rostow of claiming that since the Russians were mellowing, meaningful agreements could be reached with them. But as the noted liberal columnist Max Lerner pointed out (*New York Post,* June 22, 1962), "there is no 'appeasement' in it." Rather than accepting the "Isaac Deutscher-Erich Fromm view that internal social changes are conditioning Russian policy toward greater freedom and conciliation," Rostow had taken a "hard nuclear line" in his paper. The Rostow doctrine, according to Lerner, advanced the idea of "controlled thermonuclear war," with a position "about sparing cities, while aiming at enemy military targets—even, if necessary, in a first strike." The policy of the liberal Kennedy administration, therefore, is one which closes the door to any re-evaluation of American foreign policy which might hopefully have taken place.

Radicals and socialists, it might be hoped, should clearly see the meaning of these statements. Leaving Medicare and reform to the liberals, socialists could and should reassert the ideal of a humane society in which the quality of human relationships could blossom. Instead of devoting their time to sup-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

port of those reform measures which the corporations *do* advance as part of the welfare of corporate capitalism, radicals could and should dispense with liberalism, presenting socialism as an alternative to stagnation and war. The going will be rough and the development of a strong and radical socialist movement will not occur overnight, but it certainly will not develop at all if the ideological orientation of the Left is "anti-fascist unity" against the mythically conceived threat of a powerful Right. Leaving liberalism to the liberals, America might yet gain an independent and growing socialist Left.

Labor Secretary W. Willard Wirtz said today he wished the public was as concerned about unemployment as about strikes. More man-hours of production have been lost in the last 11 months because of unemployment than in the last 35 years because of strikes, the Secretary declared.

—*New York Times, November 26, 1962.*

BOUND AND UNBOUND VOLUMES OF MR

	Volume	Bound	Unbound
1	May 1949 - Apr. 1950	$ 12	$ 9
2	1950 - 1951	24	20*
3	1951 - 1952	10	7
4	1952 - 1953	10	7
5	1953 - 1954	12	9
6	1954 - 1955	10	7
7	1955 - 1956	10	7
8	1956 - 1957	10	7
9	1957 - 1958	12	9
10	1958 - 1959	12	9
11	1959 - 1960	9	5
12	1960 - 1961	12	9
13	1961 - 1962	9	5
	Entire Set	152	110

* Vol. 2, No. 5 not available in unbound sets.

Some of our earlier issues are out of stock. If any readers have copies of the following numbers and would return them to us, we will gladly exchange for any one of our MR Press Books: Vol. 2, Nos. 5, 7, and 8.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE DEMOLITION MEN: THE U.S. AND THE CRISIS OF NEUTRALITY IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

BY KEITH M. BUCHANAN

"The further extension of the non-committed area of the world constitutes the only possible and indispensable alternative to the policy of total division of the world into blocs and intensification of cold war policies." This is the voice of the non-aligned nations assembled at Belgrade in 1961, and it speaks to all those nations of the Third World—the impoverished, the weak and the backward—whose prospects of economic emergence, even of national survival, are jeopardized by their involvement in the geo-strategies of the Great Powers.

Nowhere is this statement more relevant than in Southeast Asia. Here cold war policies, given a peculiar bitterness by the paranoiac American antagonism to People's China, by the desperate attempts to create a coherent SEATO bloc, and by the massive build-up of the Western satellites, have initiated a process of galloping militarism. Cambodia, herself one of the leading proponents of non-alignment, alone managed to preserve a precarious neutrality and for long urged the extension of this "island" of neutrality by the inclusion of Laos; this would create a neutral wedge extending almost one thousand miles from the Chinese frontier to the Mekong delta. With the uneasy compromise recently reached between the rival factions in Laos, the miraculous and magnificent merging of the incompatible into a "government of national unity" and the declaration of Laotian neutrality, the creation of this neutral wedge would seem to become a possibility. Closer examination of the Laotian and Cambodian scenes suggests, however, that the stability of Cambodia (and a certain measure of internal stability is a *sine qua non* for effective neutrality) derives from conditions

Keith M. Buchanan, Professor of Geography in Victoria University of Wellington, New Zealand, returned recently from a tour in Southeast Asia

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

which have either never existed in Laos or which were never allowed to develop. Moreover, America's Southeast Asia policy has made the survival of genuine neutrality in Cambodia increasingly problematical and has resulted in the emergence in Laos of a neutralism whose foundations are insecure and which, at the very least, is a "left-leaning neutralism." A decade of American diplomacy has almost succeeded in demolishing the fragile prefiguring of a neutral Southeast Asia—without in any way strengthening the Western position. American policy-makers would do well to heed a saying of the author of the *Mahabharata* "Weakness is, indeed, a great being, for everything depends upon it. . . . Do not, therefore, come into hostile contact with the weak."

Unity and Diversity

Basic to an understanding of Cambodia's role in Southeast Asia is the cohesiveness of her society. Her minority peoples represent a bare ten percent of the population. The dominant group—the Khmers—are united by the bonds of a rich and developed culture which goes back almost a millenium to the great Khmer empire which centered on Angkor. Most are Hinayana Buddhists and the qualities of this faith—its tolerance, its traditions of communal aid and of care for the weak and unfortunate—these have remained a strong integrating force in Khmer life. Western economic development, when it came, introduced no new and dangerous cleavages into Khmer society; it was on a small scale and largely in the hands of a Sino-Vietnamese entrepreneurial group, thus leaving the traditional society homogeneous and coherent. And, in the last decade, the drive for social and economic progress has been fused with the secular legacy of the Khmer empire and the religious legacy of Buddhism in an indigenous Khmer socialism.

Cambodia's Popular Socialist Community (*Sangkum Reastr Niyum*) was created in 1955 largely through the efforts of one man, Prince Norodom Sihanouk. It is not a political party and one of the conditions of membership is non-membership of any political party. Its socialism is certainly not of the "classical" type; it is defined by the Khmers as "the system in which the state takes over direction of the national economy,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and protects man from the exploitation of his labor by a privileged class, safeguards his livelihood and his dignity and strives to give him the material means of finding happiness." Its *religious* roots are found in Buddhism, for Buddhism, the Cambodians argue, is neither negative nor anti-social, rather is it positive—and socialist—in its struggle against evil and social injustice. Its *secular* roots lie partly in the tradition of social development and public works inherited from the golden age of the Khmer empire; partly in the communal elements in village life which provide a humbler but important basis for socialist development of the countryside.

Politically, the Community works through an elected Assembly, and a National Congress which is an open-air assembly (probably Athenian democracy was rather similar) held at regular intervals outside the Royal Palace in Phnom Penh. Any citizen may attend the Congress, and Government members and members of Parliament attend and may be indicted or questioned on their performance. Parliament tends under these conditions to assume a secondary importance and its members tend increasingly to be regarded as "technicians" whose task is the translation into reality of the wishes expressed directly by the people at the National Congress. Cambodian sovereignty is thus manifested at the summit (the King or the throne) and at the base (the Congress) of the social hierarchy. This "polarization of sovereignty" is, in the words of one writer "the most original solution in the whole of twentieth century history to the problem of conciliating, without violence, the preservation of positive values inherited from the past with the democratization of institutions." This "direct democracy" is by no means perfect but it has played an important role, along with the Head of State's personality, in creating a strong sense of Cambodian unity. It is, however, fragile, in the sense that it can function only if extremes of political opinion can be prevented from introducing major cleavages into the community. The necessity for avoiding such a cleavage, which might serve as a pretext for external interference in Cambodian affairs, explains Sihanouk's opposition to the extreme Left (the Pracheachon party). The extent to which he can continue to maintain the political cohesion of the Community—and the stability of Cambodia—

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

depends to a very large extent upon his personal prestige and this is intimately involved with the policy of neutrality he has so passionately expounded.

Economically, Cambodia is striving to achieve a steady rate of growth (three per cent per capita per annum) within the framework of a state economic plan. The policy of non-alignment is illustrated by the fact that America and China, France and the Soviet Union, are all playing important roles in the development of specific sectors of the economy, while the pragmatic quality of Khmer socialism is illustrated by the co-existence, within both industry and commerce, of State and private enterprise. The effective economic development of the whole of the territory, to correct the existing imbalance between developed and underdeveloped regions, is a major objective of Cambodian planning. So, too, is the reduction of the existing wide differentials in living levels between town and country through community-based projects of development. And there has been a vigorous campaign to restore manual work to a place of honor with both the Head of State and his ministers seting an example by work on the various collective development projects. Policies such as these, and an austerity drive banning such ministerial perquisites as official cars and official residences, make a very real contribution to creating an effective economic and political unity within the country.

Looking at the last decade of political and economic development in Cambodia's Popular Socialist Community, it seems clear that the distinctive political organization of the country, showing itself in the accessibility of the Head of State, and the opportunity for each citizen directly to participate in decision-making through the meetings of the National Congress, have greatly contributed to the stability of Cambodia, and, through this, to the country's ability to remain firm in the face of outside pressures. The economic policy of the Community, with its emphasis on steady progress, on the evening-out of differentials between peasant and city-dweller, and its attempts to bring about through community effort a "less sharp and unjust separation between classes" these, too, have contributed to the country's social stability. And, given an abundance of cultivable land and a low population density (30 per square

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

kilometre), there is a notable absence of that peasant misery which has been such an important contributing factor to the instability of other Southeast Asian countries.

Few of these positive factors are, unfortunately, to be found in Laos. The problem of achieving national unity in the face of a broken and fragmented topography (contrast the much more favorable basin-like character of Cambodia) is aggravated by the complex patchwork of tribal groups left behind by the innumerable streams of migrating peoples who have crossed and criss-crossed this debatable border land. The Lao themselves represent about half of the total; the remainder of the population consists of some two dozen tribal groups. There is no tradition of an earlier cultural and political unity to compare with that of the Khmer empire in Cambodia and, if a certain unity was achieved under the Lan-Xang kingdom (1353-1707), it was based on a Lao hegemony. Otherwise, and for the last three centuries, Laos has been a chaos of little principalities and disputed tribal areas and this fragmentation persisted even during the colonial period. When the French withdrew, no nation-wide political movement was allowed to emerge, as in Cambodia, partly because Laos had no Sihanouk, and partly because Great Power rivalries, projected on to the relatively small Laotian elite, resulted in a chaos of competing factions whose programs and whose ambitions had little meaning to the illiterate and malaria-ridden masses. As David Wilson observes in his review of a Laotian politician's account of the last decade of crisis: "By reading the tale of the shifts and movements, the conflicts and agreements of a few men and cliques which constitute the self-styled elite of Laos, the reader becomes conscious of the lack of reference to any community of forces and impulses providing motives for these activities. The few remarks about naive peasants and wide-eyed bystanders lead one to the obvious conclusion that there is no such community." He adds, "Without some semblance of community and state structure, there is slight basis for a characteristic policy of Asian neutralism."* Whether such a com-

* Review of "Storm over Laos" by Sisouk Na Champassak in *Journal of Asian Studies,* Volume XXI, Number 2 (Feb. 1962), p. 240.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

munity and state structure might have emerged, given an effective and real neutralization of the country in the 1950's, we shall never know, for a neutral Laos was then unacceptable to the West and the emergent state was sabotaged and subverted by the "demolition men" of the West.

Neutrality—the Bitter Harvest

If, then, a cursory examination of internal conditions in Cambodia and Laos suggests that the prospects of development of a stable and neutral regime in the latter country are slender, because Laos lacks many of the positive elements present in Cambodian society, this pessimism is confirmed by an examination of the impact of the Great Powers on these two states. For Western policy, which is here largely American policy, has, by a series of disastrous errors, pushed Cambodia to the point at which drastic re-evaluation of her whole position is becoming essential; in Laos the best that can be achieved seems to be a "left-leaning" neutralism, a development which will largely thwart Sihanouk's dogged and repeated attempts to create a genuinely neutral, non-aligned, grouping of Cambodia and Laos. Let us look briefly at the events which led to this bitter harvest.

For Cambodia, sandwiched between two heavily-armed satellites of the West, in the shadow of China, and fringing a Laos which was being torn apart by Great Power rivalries, there seemed to exist no alternative to neutrality. The dangers of involvement, of the two blocs bringing their cold war to this small nation, and ultimately solving their disputes "by cheerfully slicing up our countries as if they were so many common or garden birthday cakes,"* these dangers were too well illustrated in East Asia to be lightly dismissed. But if Cambodian neutrality was, as Sihanouk saw it, "a dictate of necessity" it was by no means a passive neutrality. "It is not a question of being an ostrich or a hedgehog or of being indifferent to the fate of threatened mankind. . . . It is a position in the front-line of the struggle for disarmament and peaceful

* Speech of Prince Sihanouk to the Conference of Non-Aligned Nations, Belgrade, 1961.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

coexistence."* Cambodia's foreign policy, her attempts to achieve a solution to the problems of the Indochinese lands at the conference table, her record at the United Nations, and her restraint in the face of repeated provocation from her neighbors, all these show this policy of "positive coexistence" in action.

And the struggle to preserve Cambodian neutrality has, indeed, been a "front-line" one, for this neutrality has had to be defended with courage and tenacity, and, except for a brief Viet-Minh incursion in 1953, it has had to be defended largely against Western or "Free World" pressures. "We have had," says Sihanouk, "to face plots, an attempt at secession, the suborning of our politicians and one of our generals, armed incursions, threats and utterly unjustified territorial claims . . . all this trouble came from pro-Western troops." Thus, confronted in 1958 by the infiltration of American-equipped South Vietnamese forces, the Cambodians appealed to the United States to mediate and obtain the withdrawal of the troops. This the United States refused to do, while at the same time forbidding Cambodia to use United States-supplied arms (furnished to fight the Communists . . .) against South Vietnam as a pro-Western country. The withdrawal of Diem's forces and of the claims put forward by the Saigon government was achieved only through "the very firm declaration of support made by the Prime Minister, Chou En-lai, and Marshal Chen Yi of the People's Republic of China." Later that year a plot against the neutrality and territorial integrity of Cambodia was uncovered while Prince Sihanouk was being received "with touching marks of esteem" by President Eisenhower; it involved "executants" of American nationality, notably the diplomat Victor Matsui, and implicated "a certain American organization." Add to these incidents the continuous pressure, occasionally manifested in the crudest form, to join SEATO; a succession of pin-pricking border incidents and wild press and radio attacks; and the continuing build-up by the United States of precisely the states who are menacing Cambodia's existence—and it becomes easy to understand the bitter exasperation of the Cambodian Head of State in his Declaration of 28th October 1961: "When

* Ibid.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Thailand and South Vietnam, which have been armed to the teeth by the United States, threaten our liberty, independence, and tranquillity, an official American spokesman has the audacity to ask us to ignore these threats, and to keep our forces ready to face, side by side with the forces of these neighbors, the Communist threat to the liberty, independence and peace of Southeast Asia. Let us clarify the situation by stating that we are not at all bothered about the Communist threat, and that *we are victimized solely by the satellites of the United States and the 'Free World'.*" This situation, adds Sihanouk, will precipitate us "without hope of return towards the Socialist bloc."*

Events in Laos have followed the same dreary pattern—with the exception that the social and geographical conditions of the country were such as to make the emergence of a stabilized regime difficult enough even had the Great Powers been completely uninterested in the area. As it was, American policy (this was the Dulles era when neutrality was "immoral") toppled the one government which might have created a genuinely neutral Laos and which might have begun the uphill task of creating the conditions for a real Laotian unity and for the beginnings of economic emergence. Years of civil war and hundreds of millions of dollars of misapplied aid deformed the economy of the country and left as legacies a distrust of the West, an overgrown capital city and thousands of American cars.** And, since the only effective military force in the country has shown itself to be the Pathet Lao, the neutrality which the West suddenly decided was so necessary (this is the *post*-Dulles era) will effectively be a left-wing neutralism.

The Manichean Legacy

United States policy in Southeast Asia, permeated still by the Manichean ideas of the Dulles era, has indeed reaped a bitter harvest. The scarcely concealed pressures and the elaborate manoeuvres which were designed to consolidate the SEATO rampart (even the Great Wall of China was but a

* Quoted in *Cambodian Commentary* (Phnom-Penh) No. 12, Oct.-Dec. 1961, p. 96.

** See, for example, W. Lederer's account of "The Laos Fraud" in his book *A Nation of Sheep* (London 1961) pp. 11-31.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

partial barrier against "the Mongol hordes" . . .) have recoiled on the policy-makers in Laos and are slowly convincing Sihanouk that, if neutrality does not (or is not allowed to) work, the only policy which *will* ensure Cambodia's integrity, in the face of Thai and South Vietnamese aggression, is alignment with the socialist bloc. And should the West not heed his warning and should the policy of non-alignment on which he has pinned his faith prove no longer feasible (because of the danger from America's satellites) his whole position, and the delicate internal balance which he has maintained in Cambodia, will be thrown into jeopardy. Looking at the situation solely in Western terms, and ignoring the impact of these developments on the character of the socialist experiment in Cambodia, the result will be a dangerous polarization of forces in Southeast Asia between the extreme Right and the extreme Left, and with the balance tilting increasingly against the West. United States policy-makers, we are told, now read Mao and Guevara; perhaps they should read also the writers of ancient India and meditate on their wisdom: "Weakness is, indeed, a great being, for everything depends upon it. . . . Do not, therefore, come into hostile contact with the weak. . . . Weakness is more powerful than even the greatest Power, for that Power which is scorched by Weakness becomes totally exterminated."

The United States is the only nuclear power which has not accepted total and permanent disarmament under adequate international safeguards as its goal. . . . I think that this is a disgrace. The British have done it. The Russians have done it. We have not done it.

—Sen. Joseph S. Clark, to the Senate, February 8, 1960.

It is the psychology of non-acceptance that also inhibits our ability to compromise and leads to the idea that we can "win" the cold war. What does it mean, "win" the cold war? That the Soviet Union will fade away? That communism will disappear? These are not realistic possibilities.

—Fred Warner Neal, U.S. Foreign Policy and the Soviet Union

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WORLD EVENTS

By Scott Nearing

The World's Burden Bearer

With only six percent of the world's population, the United States is carrying a disproportionate share of the world's burdens, President Kennedy told his radio-television audience on December 17, 1962. The United States is following this policy in order to create "a counter pressure against the Communist advance."

United States military forces are playing a prominent part in resisting Communist pressure. "We have six divisions, which is about a fourth of all of the divisions on the Western front. They can fight tomorrow. . . . We are also providing the largest naval force in the world. We are also providing the nuclear force in the world . . . as well as carrying the whole burden in South Vietnam. . . . The United States is more than doing its part."

The President continued: "We have one million Americans today serving outside the United States. There is no other country in history that has carried this kind of a burden. We have two divisions in South Korea, not to control South Korea, but to defend it." Further, "180 million people, for 17 years . . . have been the great means of defending the world against the Nazi threat, and since then against the Communist threat. And if it were not for us, the Communists would be dominant in the world today."

Some nations have dominated the world militarily in order to exploit it. Some have done it to carry the white man's burden. The United States has a million armed men abroad, controlling land, sea, and air, and has a prodigious stockpile of nuclear weapons to defend the hapless world against Communist domination. All hail to the American Empire!

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Reoccupying Southeast Asia

Through the ages the Near East, the Fertile Crescent, India, and the Far East provided the sites of a long series of civilizations dating back for at least five thousand years. During these ages, North, Middle, and West Europe were a wilderness which was penetrated occasionally by Asian migrants, traders, travelers, and military adventurers. A thousand years ago Crusaders from Europe came face to face with a culture far more advanced than that of their Western motherlands.

Voyages of trade and discovery organized around the year 1450 reversed historical processes by taking to Middle and Far Asia techniques of navigation, trade, and organization that were sufficiently superior to their Asian counterparts to give the Europeans a toe-hold which was quickly broadened as the Western empire-builders took over one Asian area after another until the virtual economic and political domination of Europe over Asia was established.

Industrialization and the rapid growth of the Japanese Empire marked a change, in both tempo and direction. Asia, with half the human race living on its land mass, began reasserting itself. The Japanese planned a "co-prosperity sphere" that would have included two thirds of the Asian peoples. By 1943 the Japanese had expelled the Westerners from large areas of Middle and Far Asia. India and Burma threw off the British yolk in 1947. Indonesia expelled the Dutch. China turned over and stood up in 1949. Indo-China drove out the French in 1954. War in Korea and in Malaya tested the strength of the new Asian regimes and found them holding firmly.

The struggles for independence and self-determination waged by the Asians against their imperialist European overlords were overshadowed and sometimes dominated by the wealth, productivity, and military prowess of the United States. It was the United States which defeated and occupied Japan. It was also the United States which outlined, occupied, and fortified a defense perimeter that extended along the island chain from the Aleutians, through the Japanese Archipelago, South Korea, the Philippines to Taiwan and Singapore.

United States emissaries announced themselves as liberators. With them came technicians, traders, and investors. At

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

their beck and call were air patrols, naval units, marines. No sooner had they arrived than they began digging themselves in; establishing, equipping, and manning powerful military bases. A dozen years after war's end in 1945, European imperialists were virtually eliminated from Far Asia and Southeast Asia. The one powerful pre-war Asian nation, Japan, was hog-tied politically and occupied militarily by United States armed forces. On the surface, at least, Far Asia was changing foreign masters. The Europeans had gone. The Americans were rapidly taking their vacated places.

The reoccupation of Asia has not been easy. Millions of Asians are trained guerrilla fighters. Asians are anti-foreign, therefore anti-American. The Korean War had been a draw, leaving North Korea Communist. The Indo-China War left North Vietnam in the same camp. For the last three years the issue has been joined in Laos and South Vietnam. China, the keystone of Far Asian population and power, is organizing, industrializing, modernizing, and socializing at top speed.

Can the West, acting through NATO and SEATO and through its Washington representatives, regroup its forces, establish new alliances with the Asian bourgeoisie, regain their lost ground, dig themselves in militarily, and reoccupy Far Asia economically and politically? So critical is this issue that President Kennedy has sent thousands of United States military personnel onto the battlefields of Laos and South Vietnam.

Chinese, North Koreans, North Vietnamese are demanding that the "imperialist" armed forces leave Asian soil. Twenty years ago the word "imperialists," when used by Asians, meant British, French, Dutch, and Japanese. Today it refers almost entirely to one power: the United States.

War in Vietnam

Civil war of sorts has been raging in Vietnam for a score of years. At the end of the first period, in 1954, North Vietnam turned its attention to building socialism, while South Vietnam continued as a satellite of the West, with an agreement that provided for a plebiscite within two years. No plebiscite was ever held, because, in the opinion of the then Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, if it had been held it would have

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

been won by the leftists. Meanwhile, the operating costs of South Vietnam, including those of a very large military establishment, were paid by the United States government.

The purpose of the South Vietnamese military apparatus was to protect the government against the Left which had built up a large following in the villages. Through guerrilla warfare the leftists, or Vietcong, gradually took the countryside, leaving the South Vietnamese government of Ngo Dinh Diem in control of little more than the capital.

At this point President Kennedy's administration stepped in with a program designed to save South Vietnam from Communism and from the Vietnamese. Diem's United States advisers decided to do this by concentrating the villagers of Left-controlled districts in barbed-wire enclosures, thus cutting the Vietcong off from their food supplies and shelter. The sympathetic leftist villages were razed or burned. This was called "Operation Sunrise."

At the same time the U.S.-equipped army of Diem, reinforced by some ten thousand United States military personnel, supplied with planes, helicopters, and other transport services, launched a campaign to drive the guerrillas out of the jungles. In this operation, U.S. personnel did everything except pull the triggers.

This military operation has proved very expensive. David Halberstam, writing from Saigon, on December 2, 1962, stated the cost at "more than $1,000,000 a day." (*New York Times,* December 3, 1962.)

Military minds respond slowly to changing situations. French generals, bolstered by much U.S. advice and material support, spent eight years and a great deal of manpower in an effort to drive native "Communists" out of these same jungles. The result was disastrous, with a humiliating defeat for the French. Now U.S. generals are endeavoring to achieve the same objective, backed by unlimited supplies of money and mechanical equipment. To date they have failed as dismally as their French confreres.

When Roman legions encountered similar stubborn opposition from peasant populations, they found that there was only one workable solution: to kill every able-bodied man, deport the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

women and children, and sell them as slaves. If the Kennedy administration is really desirous of preserving South Vietnam as a part of the "Free World" and at the same time saving more than a million dollars a day now being spent to conquer Vietnamese, we would call President Kennedy's attention to this thoroughly tested Roman precedent.

Operation Scare-Off

Many explanations of the Cuban crisis have been offered since October. We would like to cite one which has received less consideration than it deserves. There are two big issues facing mankind: (1) postponing nuclear war and (2) making socialism work. Operation Scare-Off may have been designed by the Russians to deal with both issues.

Cuba, under the Castro administration, has been passing through an authentic socialist revolution. Property and class relations have been transformed. Old institutions and practices associated with the Western way of life have been discarded and replaced by institutions and practices commonly called socialist. Today Cuba is the only nation in the Western Hemisphere to which the word socialist can be correctly applied.

Cuba is surrounded by water, land, and air spaces all occupied by U.S. military forces. Despite strong popular sympathy for the Castro regime in Latin American countries, every self-governing nation in the Western Hemisphere has taken an anti-Castro stand. This political isolation of Cuba and its condemnation by the Organization of American States have been achieved by a combination of Alliance for Progress anti-Communist hush money and vigorous diplomatic arm-twisting by Washington.

Efforts by the Cuban delegation and their friends in the United Nations to have the United States declared an aggressor because of its open intervention in Cuba's internal affairs proved fruitless during October and November, 1962. Only the socialist countries, all located in Europe and Asia, rallied to Cuba's support.

In the summer and fall of 1962, news stories and propaganda articles were preparing the U.S. public for a second invasion of Cuba. The Washington government, in both the ex-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ecutive and legislative branches, was repeating the slogan: "Castro must go."

Soviet economic and technical aid for Cuba was increased during 1962, supplemented by military equipment and personnel. The Russians agreed to construct a base for the joint use of Cuban and Soviet fishing fleets. They also built a missile base, with uncamouflaged Soviet missiles sticking out all over the place, to be photographed by low-flying U.S. planes.

The Soviet purpose seemed to be three fold. First, to tide Cuba's socialist economy over a tough spot; second, to prevent another invasion of Cuba in the autumn of 1962; and third, to avoid a nuclear war which Washington threatened to wage if necessary in order to liquidate the one socialist state in the Americas.

President Kennedy reacted sharply to the build-up and military support of Cuba. He did not refer the matter to the United Nations or the OAS. Instead, he acted unilaterally and dictatorially by making his peremptory October 22 broadcast, in which he announced the blockade of Cuba, the taking of naval and air control of the high seas, and establishment of search and seizure of all planes and ships approaching the island. These acts not only went far beyond the limits which necessity demanded and which wisdom would have counseled, but constituted a violation of international law and a challenge to war, directed specifically against the Soviet Union.

The Soviet Union, instead of rising to the challenge, discreetly removed its missiles and other stage properties from Cuba and proceeded to negotiate a settlement. The results of Operation Scare-Off were: first, disruption of the schedule for an immediate invasion of Cuba; second, a tentative White House promise of no future invasion of the island; and third, *no nuclear war.*

Humanity's future on this planet depends to a large extent upon success in the dual operation of postponing nuclear war and building planet-wide socialism. Operation Scare-Off made a notable contribution in both directions by ignoring Kennedy's challenge to fight and by giving the only socialist republic in the Western Hemisphere a new lease on life.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MR PRESS BOOKS

	List Price	Price with Sub
REPORT TO THE STOCKHOLDERS by John Beecher	$3.00	$7.50
THE UNITED STATES, CUBA, AND CASTRO by William A. Williams	3.25	8.00
THE SECOND REVOLUTION IN CUBA by J. P. Morray	3.25	8.00
CUBA—ANATOMY OF A REVOLUTION by Huberman and Sweezy	3.50	8.00
GUERRILLA WARFARE by Che Guevara	3.50	8.00
CROSSING THE LINE by Claud Cockburn	3.50	8.00
AN ESSAY ON ECONOMIC GROWTH AND PLANNING by Maurice Dobb	3.50	8.00
WELLINGTON ROAD by Margaret Lassell	3.75	8.50
VIEW FROM THE WEST by Claud Cockburn	3.75	8.50
BURNING CONSCIENCE by Claude Eatherly and Gunther Anders	4.00	8.50
THE ALIENATION OF MODERN MAN by Fritz Pappenheim	4.00	8.50
PRIDE OF STATE by J. P. Morray	4.00	8.50
TIDE WITHOUT TURNING by John Gill	4.50	9.00
THE EMPIRE OF OIL by Harvey O'Connor	5.00	9.00
THE WALL BETWEEN by Anne Braden	5.00	9.00
THE POLITICAL ECONOMY OF GROWTH by Paul A. Baran	5.00	9.00
NORTH FROM MEXICO by Carey McWilliams	5.00	9.00

(continued on next page)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MR PRESS BOOKS *(continued)*

	List Price	Price with Sub
THE THEORY OF CAPITALIST DEVELOPMENT by Paul M. Sweezy	6.00	10.00
THE RAGGED TROUSERED PHILANTHROPISTS by Robert Tressell	6.00	10.00
THE GREAT ROAD by Agnes Smedley	6.75	10.50
EDUCATION AND THE WORKING CLASS by Jackson and Marsden	6.75	10.50
CASTE, CLASS & RACE by Oliver C. Cox	7.50	11.00
WORLD CRISIS IN OIL by Harvey O'Connor	7.50	11.00
THE PEN AND THE SWORD by Michael Foot	7.50	11.00
FROM YALTA TO DISARMAMENT by J. P. Morray	8.50	12.00

MR PRESS PAPERBACKS

CAPITALISM YESTERDAY AND TODAY
by Maurice Dobb (flexible cloth binding) $1.00

THE ALIENATION OF MODERN MAN
by Fritz Pappenheim 1.25

AMERICAN RADICALS: SOME PROBLEMS AND PERSONALITIES
Harvey Goldberg, editor 1.25

AMERICAN LABOR IN MIDPASSAGE
Bert Cochran, editor 1.25

MAN'S WORLDLY GOODS
by Leo Huberman 1.75

CUBA: ANATOMY OF A REVOLUTION
by Leo Huberman and Paul M. Sweezy 1.75

THE PRESENT AS HISTORY
by Paul M. Sweezy (flexible cloth binding) 2.95

PAPERBACK SPECIAL
All the above books 9.00

Monthly Review Press 333 Sixth Avenue New York 14, N. Y.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Just published!

SOCIALISM IN PRACTICE

by SCOTT NEARING

No one is better equipped than Prof. Nearing for the writing of a book on the transformation of East Europe under the impact of socialism since the end of the Second World War. A world traveller, author of scores of books, he brought with him in the course of his extensive travels through the East European countries, in the spring of 1962, a wealth of mature observation buttressed by many decades of experience and training as an economist and professional sociologist. Embracing Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Rumania, Poland and Yugoslavia, the present study answers many questions and clarifies widely held misconceptions about socialism as it is developing and advancing in daily practice in a large part of Europe.

Paperback $1.50; cloth $2.50

At your bookshop or

NEW CENTURY PUBLISHERS
832 Broadway New York 3, N. Y.

(advertisement)

PAMPHLET PACKET $3

Why Socialism? by Albert Einstein	20¢
Principles of Communism by Engels (trans. by Paul M. Sweezy)	25¢
Problems of Disarmament by Hans A. Bethe and Others	35¢
Waste in American Medicine by a Committee of Physicians	35¢
Socialism is the Only Answer by Huberman and May	35¢
Marxian Socialism; and Power Elite Or Ruling Class?	35¢
The Theory of U. S. Foreign Policy by Sweezy and Huberman	35¢
Reflections on the Cuban Revolution by Paul A. Baran	50¢
The ABC of Socialism by Huberman and May	50¢
Economic Development, Planning, And International Cooperation by Oskar Lange	50¢
British Guiana by Ved Prakash Vatuk	50¢
Total	$4.20

PAMPHLET PACKET SPECIAL
All the above pamphlets $3

Send your order, with payment enclosed, to
Monthly Review Press 333 Sixth Avenue New York 14, N. Y.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(*continued from inside front cover*)

To members of the Associates all new pamphlets are sent free of charge—the Einstein reprint included. (Have *you* joined the Associates yet?)

Counting the new pamphlets just off the press and the old ones still in print, MR Press has available 11 pamphlets covering a wide range of subjects. On page 592 their prices are given separately, and together as a Pamphlet Packet at a reduced price.

New books for which prepublication orders are now being accepted are: A. L. Morton, *The Life and Ideas of Robert Owen* (prepub price $2.25, publication $3.50); and Heinz Abosch, *The Menace of the Miracle: Germany from Hitler to Adenauer* (prepub price $3.25, after publication $5). The latter is a revised and expanded edition of a book that first appeared in French in a series sponsored by Sartre's magazine *Les Temps Modernes*. The French historian Daniel Guérin hailed Heinz Abosch's book, when it first appeared, as "one of the most brilliant essays of the year."

We are in the habit of griping about the lack of reviews of MR Press books, but we are glad to be able to report that in the case of Michael Foot's *The Pen and the Sword* we have no ground for complaint. The December 29th issue of *The New Yorker* carries a review which says in part: "A small slice of history magnified to great advantage. . . . Though the author is in something of a bind as far as sympathies go—Marlborough was a great man, and Swift behaved like a small one in this encounter—he gives both men their due. Mr. Foot is a journalist who knows how to write, and, as a Member of Parliament, he has a special feeling for the clashes that make politics—and books—exciting." And the influential *Library Journal* concludes its no less enthusiastic review: "Here is solid history, more exhilarating than fiction and vastly better written; it is a *tour de force* equal in many ways to G. Mattingly's recent *Armada* and will appeal to the same readers. Eminently purchasable for all collections." Our supply of this book is strictly limited, so if you want a copy you'd better hurry. Price $7.50.

Two corrections: (1) In the December issue the price of Huberman and May, *The ABC of Socialism,* was incorrectly announced. The right price is 50¢ for single copies, five copies for $2, and 13 copies for $5. (2) In the footnote on page 478 of the January issue Andrew Gunder Frank's article, "Mexico: the Janus Faces of 20th Century Bourgeois Revolution," was incorrectly placed in the October 1962, issue. The correct month was November.

Readers will be glad to learn that the 1962 Christmas book sale was the biggest in MR's history. Many thanks. Now how about getting new subscribers?

As an aid and stimulus, we offer the following: a special student subscription to the end of the school year for only $2. This will bring five issues of MR, beginning with January (which includes the editorial on the Sino-Indian border dispute and Carlos Fuentes' brilliant article "The Argument of Latin America: Words for the North Americans").

A California subscriber has ordered five copies each of the Williams, Morray, and Beecher books with this note: "They are all excellent books, and indeed will make wonderful belated Christmas presents; but I would like especially to commend the excellent writing, printing, and binding of Mr. Beecher's book. It is a treasure." *Report to the Stockholders and Other Poems,* by John Beecher, is the first venture by MR Press into the field of poetry. We are proud of it both for its contents and its appearance. Price $3.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MR PRESS announces two new books

THE MENACE OF THE MIRACLE: Germany from Hitler to Adenauer

by Heinz Abosch

The author attempts to relate the development of German society since the war to the economic, social, and moral problems of our time.

Publication date—April.

List price $5 Prepub price $3

THE LIFE AND IDEAS OF ROBERT OWEN

by A. L. Morton

A general account of the life and work of Robert Owen, the founder of British Cooperation and Socialism, through his own writings and works.

Publication date—March.

List price $3.50 Prepub price $2.25

Send your order, with payment enclosed, to

Monthly Review Press 333 Sixth Ave. New York 14, N. Y.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED